

738

6. 807.

2 VOLTS
10/-



HAND-BOOK

FOR THE

STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF POPERY,

WITH

SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ITS POLITICAL RELATIONS.

By A LAYMAN.

VOL. I.

"*Controversy* is the wind that winnoweth the Truth."—BACON.

"I believe, and because I believe, therefore will I speak it, that this (the Romanist) controversy is now become *an indispensable branch of Christian Education*."—CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH.

"There is not, and there never has been, on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the *Roman Catholic Church*."—MACAULAY.

"As to Papists, their tenets are undoubtedly calculated for the introduction of *all slavery, Political and Religious*."—BLACKSTONE.

"To design the advancement of Popery, is to design *the ruin of the state*."—
SHERLOCK.

I make no hesitation to affirm that the Popish religion, not the Catholic, has been mediately or immediately the cause of almost all the *political disturbances in Europe since the days of Gregory VII.*"—GOOD'S "MEMOIRS OF GEDDES"
—a Roman Catholic witness.

EDINBURGH:

GEORGE M'GIBBON, 53 ROSE STREET.

o

1868.



CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE,	1
ORGANISATION FOR THE STUDY OF THE CONTROVERSY—	
The best Foundation for the Study of Popery, .	1
Class Instruction based upon this Foundation, .	1
DEVELOPMENT THEORY OF POPERY—	
Modern Advocates of Popery confess to the Original Incompleteness of the System—Tradition abandoned for Development,	1
The new Dogmas of the Church required this new Rule of Faith,	1
This change in the Tactics of the Church needs the Adoption of a New Line of Controversy,	1
DRS MOHLER AND NEWMAN ON DEVELOPMENT—	
Development of the Doctrine of Development, commenced as early as the Council of Florence, 1428,	2
Development adopted and systematised by Mohler and Newman,	2
Has the Advantage of being in Accordance with the Facts of History,	3
Homologated by the Rulers and Writers of the Papacy,	3
DEVELOPMENT AS EXPOUNDED BY THE ROMISH ORGAN, CALLED THE “HOME AND FOREIGN REVIEW”—	
The “Home and Foreign Review,” (a continuation of the Notorious Rambler,) edited by Sir John Acton, noticed,	3
Quoted on Development—Explains how Dogmas are Developed—Shows that New Articles of Faith are derived from the Public Opinion of the Church, and not from the “Holy See,”	4

FOURFOLD DEVELOPMENT OF POPERY—

A Protestant View of the Doctrine and Process of Development,	5
The Phenomena of the Papacy can only be explained by the Theory of Development, which includes four distinct and consecutive forms—viz., the Historical, Theological, Political, and Prophetical,	5

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF POPERY—

Development proceeds from Practice to Principle—the “Tracts for the Times” quoted to this effect,	5
The Process illustrated by Mohler and Newman, particularly in their treatment of the Pope’s Office,	6

THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF POPERY—

Popish Articles of Faith, how formed—illustrated by the case of the Immaculate Conception,	6
--	---

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF POPERY—

Development of the Political from the Spiritual Power of the Papacy,	7
Form of Defence set up in support of the Pope’s Temporal Usurpations,	7

PROPHETICAL DEVELOPMENT OF POPERY—

Scripture Prophecy accurately foreshadows the Development of the Papacy,	7
The Historical, Theological, and Political Developments of Popery noticed in relation to Prophecy,	8
Prophecy Foreshadows all Three,	8

STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF POPERY ACCORDING TO ITS FOURFOLD DEVELOPMENT—

The four Phases of Development—viz., the Historical, Theological, Political, and Prophetical—recommended as a basis of arrangement for a Systematic Study of the Romish Controversy,	8
--	---

STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF HISTORICAL ROMANISM—

Reference to the Subjects included under this head of Development,	9
Ecclesiastical History in the main is but the History of the Rise, Progress, and Establishment of Papal Corruptions,	9

STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF THEOLOGICAL ROMANISM—

Style of Subjects included in this department of Development,	9
In this Department the New Rule of Development especially antagonises the Old Rule of Tradition,	10

STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF POLITICAL ROMANISM—

Questions proper to this Phase of Development concern the Relations of Popery to Politics,	10
Comprehend the Relations of Popery to Civil Institutions, both as respects the Magistrate and Subject,	10

STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF PROPHETICAL POPERY—

The Questions here have for their Object the Relations of Popery to Prophecy,	10
Scripture Prophecy determines the Rise, Growth, Characteristics, and Destinies of the Papacy,	10
Assigns the Period of 1260 years for the Erection and Continuance of the Papacy—Different Commencements, and Consequent Different Terminations, assigned to this Period—Probable Overthrow of the System by Three Corresponding Stages of Destruction,	11
Order of these Stages referred to and illustrated,	11
The Consideration of the Chronological Beginnings and Overthrow of the Papacy belong to the Prophetical Department of Development,	12

PRACTICAL ORGANISATION FOR THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF POPERY ON THE BASIS OF ITS FOURFOLD DEVELOPMENT—

Organisation of Classes based on the Fourfold Development of Popery,	12
The most Suitable and Effective Class Exercises referred to,	12
Class Exercises specified and recommended,	13
Class Regulations referred to,	13

INTRODUCTION, 15

NECESSITY AND DUTY OF THE ROMISH CONTROVERSY—

The Christian Life Scripturally Characterised as a Warfare—this Warfare includes the Duty of “Contending for the Faith once delivered to the Saints”—Judicial Consequences of False Religion,	15
---	----

Continued Prevalence of False Religions in the Christian Dispensation—Popery, as the Grand Enemy of Truth, merits the Peculiar Opposition of the Christian Soldier—"No Peace with Rome," . . .	16
Comparative Insignificance of all other Controversial Opponents—Babylon marshalling her Ranks for a Grand Final Struggle,	16
The Coming Battle must be fought for the Defence of Political as well as Religious Privileges,	16

POLITICAL FAITH OF THE PAPACY—

The Relation of Popery to Politics a Prominent Feature of the Present Work—Evil Effects of neglecting to sufficiently recognise the <i>Political</i> Characteristics of the Papacy,	16
The Secular Element in Romanism the <i>Soul</i> of the System—Popery as a Religion an Illusion and a Sham; as a Secular Policy a Substantial Reality, . . .	17

DISTINCTIVE TREATMENT OF RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL POPERY—

The Religious and Civil Elements of the Papacy to be carefully discriminated in Controversy,	17
Respective Distinctions between Popery as a Religion and Popery as a Policy,	17
Popery as a System of Policy should enlist the Opposition of <i>all men</i> ,	17
Popery as a Religion is most effectually opposed by Scripture; as a Temporal Policy it must be combated by various other weapons,	18
As a Religion it must be repelled by Moral Means; as a Policy by the Civil Power,	18
The Relation of Popery to the Civil Power calls for such attempts as the present work,	18

POLITICAL RELATIONS AND NATIONAL INFLUENCES OF RELIGION—

Religion necessarily involves Political Associations, . . .	18
True Religion promotes the Ends of Civil Government, . . .	18
False Religion injurious to Political Interests,	19

COMPARATIVE INFLUENCE OF POPERY AND PROTESTANTISM—

Different Effects of Popery and Protestantism upon Civil and Social Interests; the one a National Curse, the other a National Blessing,	19
---	----

PAPAL ABUSE OF RELIGION TO SECULAR ENDS—

Milton's "Paradise Lost" quoted to this Effect,	19
The Religious Ordinances of the Papacy converted into an Instrumentality for the Acquisition of Worldly Wealth and Power,	19
Extraordinary Change effected in the Government of the Christian Church to promote the Secular Power and Wealth of the Priesthood,	20

POLITICAL CONSTITUTION OF THE PAPACY—

Romanism a Vast and Complicated Secular Organisation,	20
Effects of this Organisation upon Secular Government,	20

FALLACY OF TREATING POPERY AS A RELIGION OR SYSTEM
OF WORSHIP—

British Protestantism largely affected by this Fallacy,	20
The Church of Rome seeks the Full Recovery of her Forfeited Political Power in this Country,	21
Changes her Tactics from Secret to Open Opposition as Expediency calls for it,	21

DECLINE OF ROMANISM IN ROMISH STATES—

Rapid Declension of Romanism in its own Homesteads —Aggressions of the Civil Powers on the Tempo- ralities of the System—Luminous Fulfilment of Prophecy in this case,	21
---	----

PROGRESS OF ROMANISM IN PROTESTANT LANDS—

Prophecy betokens this—Fatal Policy of cherishing Romanism here by Political Privileges and En- dowments—Increasing Conversions of Protestants to Popery,	22
The Papal Aggression of 1850 effecting its Intended Objects,	22

THE PROGRESS OF POPERY NECESSITATES A CORRESPONDING
DECLENSION OF PROTESTANTISM—

Popery and Christianity cannot flourish together— hence the present Progress of Popery in Britain betokens the Corresponding Declension of Pro- testant Principle—the Popish Archbishop Hughes, of New York, referred to on the Decline of Pro- testantism,	23
--	----

PROBABLE FEARFUL ISSUE TO PROTESTANTISM—

Ominous Aspect of Prophecy in Relation to the Future of Protestant "Witnesses,"	23
Possible Approaching Trials of such Witnesses should excite to Diligence and Effort in the Cause of Truth,	23
This Work professes to be little more than a Digest of Heads,	23
The Work Constructed with Reference to the Principle of "Development,"	24
This Principle Necessitates such Compendiums, the present being designed to facilitate Inquiry on the Political Relations of Popery,	24

HAND-BOOK FOR THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF POLITICAL POPERY,

25

CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT—

Society composed of the <i>Governors</i> and the <i>Governed</i> ,	25
The Two Orders of Membership Constitute the <i>State</i> ,	25
Significations of the terms, <i>Polity</i> , <i>Policy</i> , <i>Politic</i> , and <i>Political</i> ,	25
Policy and Politic applied to denote Prudential Action,	25
Definite Exposition of the phrase, "Civil Power,"	26
<i>Civil Power</i> put in Opposition to <i>Ecclesiastical Power</i> ,	26

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE STATE AND THE CHURCH—

Historical Conflicts between these Powers—Necessary Supremacy of one of these Powers,	26
---	----

THEORY OF MUTUAL INDEPENDENCE, OR CO-ORDINATE JURISDICTION IN CHURCH AND STATE—

The Theory Supported by Zealous Advocacy—Dr Wylie quoted in its Support—Untenable Character of this Theory—the Mutual Independence of Church and State Unsound in Theory and Impossible in Practice,	27
Indefensibility of the Attempt to support this Theory on the Principle that the Church and State are Independent in Separate Spheres of Action,	28
No Alternative between Supreme Authority on the Part of one or other—the Church or State,	28
A Single Fountain of Authority in Human Affairs taught by the Principle of Divine Government,	28

	PAGE
Illustrated by a Reference to the Relationship between the Kingly and Priestly Offices of Christ,	29
By a further Reference to the Official Relations of Moses and Aaron,	29
By Reference to the Jewish Constitution,	29
By Reference to New Testament Teaching,	29
By Reference to the ruling Relationship of Husband and Wife,	30
Invalidity of Objections to the Principle of Civil Su- premacy,	30
Further Objections to the Principle Stated and Dis- proved,	30
Further Objections further Disproved,	31
POLITICAL CONFUSION OF CO-ORDINATION IN CHURCH AND STATE—	
Political Evils arising from the Principle of Co-ordina- tion in Church and State,	31
ISAAC BARROW ON THE POLITICAL EVILS OF CO-ORDINATION IN CHURCH AND STATE—	
Quotations from Barrow to this Effect,	33
AUTHORITY OF THE MAGISTRATE IN RELATION TO RELIGION—	
Views Opposed to the Authority of the Magistrate in Relation to Religion,	34
Strictures on the Views referred to,	34
Such Views opposed to Scripture,	34
The Magistrate <i>Officially</i> as well as <i>Personally</i> pos- sessed of a Religious Character,	35
The Magistrate's Province in Religion indicated by his Responsibility in relation to <i>National Sin</i> ,	35
THE FUNCTION OF THE MAGISTRATE IN RELATION TO RELI- GION—	
Rights and Duties of the State in Relation to Religion,	36
OPPOSITE POLITY OF POPERY AND PROTESTANTISM IN THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE—	
Consistent Protestantism obliged to hold the Theory of Civil Supremacy—Popery necessarily identified with the opposite Theory of Ecclesiastical Supre- macy,	37
Bull of Boniface VIII. quoted to this effect,	37

	PAGE
Gregory Nazianzen quoted to the same effect,	37
Popery Right <i>if</i> the State has no Political Relationship to the Church or Religion,	37
Analogies supporting the principle of Civil Supremacy,	38
Further Analogies to the same effect,	38
Professed Independence of the Civil Power the most Distinctive Characteristic of Popery,	38
The Scripture quoted to this effect,	38
Further reference to Scripture to the same effect,	39
Ceremonial Constitutions of the Papacy quoted in sup- port of the Pope's claim to Civil Supremacy,	39
Assumed Supremacy of the Canon Law over the Civil Law,	39
The Papal Aggression referred to, and its Bull quoted,	39
Futility of the Argument against Civil Supremacy de- rived from "Religious Liberty,"	40
Futility of the Argument against Civil Supremacy de- rived from the State of the Church before Con- stantine,	40
 CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL POPERY—	
The Erastian principle of "Civil Religion,"	41
The Popish principle of Ecclesiastical or Hierarchical Religion,	41
Distinction between Civil and Ecclesiastical Popery,	41
 DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL POPERY—	
Popery—	
1. A Willing Dependant on the State,	41
2. Claiming Authority with the State on the Prin- ciple of "Co-ordination,"	41
3. Claiming Supremacy over the State,	41
4. In the Days of its Humiliation yielding a Coercive Subjection to the State,	41
First Stage of this Development commenced under Constantine,	42
Second Stage under Charlemagne,	42
Third Stage, about the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century under Frederick II.	42
Fourth Stage commenced with the Reformation,	42
A Fifth Development of Popery in the Future,	42
Rome Courting Democracy,	43
Coming Contest of Romanism, Royalty, and Revolution,	43
Future Policy of Rome,	43

	PAGE
CAUSES AFFECTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL POPERY—	
1. <i>Motive or Moral Causes,</i>	43
2. <i>Instrumental Causes,</i>	43
3. <i>Circumstantial Causes,</i>	43
Isaac Barrow's Work on Supremacy referred to,	44
BARROW'S THIRTY-SIX CAUSES, ACCOUNTING FOR THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PAPACY—	
Consecutive Enumeration of the above,	44-48
SPIRITUAL BASIS OF POLITICAL POPERY—	
Rome's Assumed Authority in Relation to the <i>Soul</i> the Basis of her Temporal Pretensions,	48
Tradition the Source of her Spiritual Power,	49
THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.—	
The Creed quoted,	49
THE POWERS OF POPE PIUS IV.—	
The Creed of Pope Pius IV. shown to be simply a Theological Embodiment of the Powers Claimed by the Papacy,	50
Paraphrase of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., exhibiting the Bearings of each Article on the Pope's Power,	51
POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.—	
Adaptation of the Creed to the Advancement of Priestly Ambition, Avarice, and Tyranny,	53
Political Relations of the Creed as a Whole—of Individual Dogmas—the Priest through this Creed becomes the Jailer of the Conscience, and rules the Political through the Religious Man,	53
The Skilful Mingling of Truth and Falsehood for the Purpose of Deception a Peculiar Characteristic of Popery,	53
Illustrations of the preceding Principle,	53
The several Articles of the Creed have each a Distinctive Bearing upon Temporal Interests,	54
POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE FIRST ARTICLE OF THE CREED—	
"Paradise Lost" quoted,	55
Adroit Attempt of the Papacy to identify the Creed of Pope Pius IV. with the Nicene Creed, and the Church of Rome with the Church of the Nicene Formula,	55
Tradition as a Source of Evidence,	55

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF TRADITION—

Tradition as characterised by the “Home and Foreign Review,”	56
The Church of Rome accommodates Tradition to her Political as well as her Religious wants,	56

APOSTOLICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITIONS—

Apostolic Tradition, What?	56
Rhemish Testament quoted on Tradition,	56
Ecclesiastical Tradition, What?	57

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF APOSTOLICAL TRADITION—

Rhemish Testament quoted on the Pope's Right to Inflict <i>Corporeal Penalties</i> ,	57
Rhemish Testament quoted in Support of the Proposition, that “the Bishop is to be Honoured <i>before the King</i> ,”	57
Rhemish Testament quoted on the Punishment of Heretics by <i>Penal Laws</i> ,	58
Rhemish Testament quoted on the Exemption of Priests from <i>Civil Taxes</i> ,	58
Rhemish Testament quoted in Proof that Heretics ought to be <i>Punished and Executed</i> , when such can be accomplished with Safety to the Church of Rome,	58
Rhemish Testament quoted in Proof that the Church has a Right to employ the Use of “the Secular Arm” against Heretics,	59

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION—

Propagation by Ecclesiastical Tradition of the Celebrated Forgery called the “Constantine Donation,”	59
Abbé Fleury quoted on this Donation,	59
The Pope's Title to the Donation disputed by the Lombard Kings,	60
The Donation supported by a Forged Letter, ascribed to St Peter by Ecclesiastical Tradition,	60
Extract of the Letter, from Fleury's Ecclesiastical Discourses,	61
The “Donation” supported by King Pepin,	61

UTILITARIAN BASIS OF TRADITION—

The Forgeries connected with “Peter's Patrimony” perpetrated by Rome on the Jesuit Maxim that it is lawful to lie for a “Good Cause,”	61
---	----

Tradition ascribing the Confirmation of Peter's Patri- mony to Pepin, Charlemagne, and others,	61
Ecclesiastical Tradition in Support of the Forged "De- cretals of Isadore,"	62
Mosheim quoted on the Isadorean Decretals,	62
Mosheim again quoted on the Popish Doctrine of Justifiable Fraud for the Good of the Church,	63
Fleury quoted on the Forgery of the Constantine Do- nation,	63
The Constantine Forgery one of the Chief Instruments by which the Pope's Usurpations were supported for Ages,	64

RELATION OF TRADITION TO DEVELOPMENT—

Attempts of Romish Advocates to reconcile Tradition and Development,	64
The Roman Catholic Bishop Brown quoted to this Effect,	64
Opposition between Dr Newman and Bishop Brown,	65
Superiority of Bishop Brown's Theory,	65

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE SECOND ARTICLE OF THE CREED—

Second Article quoted,	65
"Paradise Lost" quoted,	65

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE BIBLE—

The Bible the Charter of Political as well as Religious Liberty,	66
Evidence of this from the History of the Influence of the Bible in the World,	66
Processes adopted to Convert the World without the Bible,	67
The Doctrine and Policy contained in [the Creed of Pius IV. have for their simple object to advance the Arbitrary Power of the Pope,	67
Rise of Waldensian Testimony against Popish Errors— met on the part of the Pope by the Agency of St Dominick and the Inquisition,	67
Success of the Pope in the Suppression of "Heresy" until the Invention of Printing,	68
The Reformation owed its Success to this opportunely- discovered Instrumentality,	68

POLICY OF POPERY IN RELATION TO THE BIBLE—

Rome's Claim, not only to the Exclusive Power to Interpret the Bible, but also to the Possession and Control of the Book as a Matter of Civil Property,	68
These Claims a Matter of not less Importance to Political than Spiritual Freedom,	69
The Bible, according to Rome, a Padlocked Revelation, only to be opened by the Key of Tradition,	69

MUTUAL RELATIONS OF SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION—

Theory of Romanism that Tradition is the Expositor and Witness of Scripture,	69
Bishop Milner quoted to this Effect,	69
Milner's Remarkable Concession that his Church "has no Tradition to Interpret a very great proportion of Scripture,"	70

TRUE RELATIONSHIP OF SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION, VIZ.—

Instead of Tradition being the Interpreter and Witness of Scripture, Scripture is the Interpreter and Witness of Tradition,	70
Chronological Relationship of Scripture and Tradition,	71

SCRIPTURE THE EXPOSITOR AND WITNESS OF TRADITION—

Illustration of this Principle from the Double Delivery, Oral and Written, of the Decalogue,	71
Exod. xxxi. 18, xxx. 6, and xxxviii. 21 referred to,	72
Illustrations of the same Principle from the Scriptures at large,	72
Real Object of the Scripture not to <i>Reveal</i> , but to <i>Testify</i> , to Truth already and otherwise revealed,	73
By reversing the True Relationship of Scripture and Tradition, Popery furnished itself with the most Dexterous of all her Weapons,	73
The Bible, even supplemented by Tradition, not the Popish Rule of Faith,	73
Milner quoted to this Effect,	73
The <i>Priest Himself</i> the Sole Rule of Faith to the Romanist,	74
Milner quoted on the Exclusive Claim of the Priests to the Bible,	74

POLITICAL LEGISLATION OF POPERY IN RELATION TO THE BIBLE—

The Pope's Corporations called "Congregations,"	74
---	----

The "Congregation of the Holy Office," or the Inquisition, unable to cope with the Power of the Press,	75
--	----

THE CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX—

Legislation against the Press initiated by the Fifth Council of Lateran,	75
Decree of the Council quoted,	75
Initiation of "the Index," or Official Catalogue of Prohibited Books, prepared and published from Time to Time by Rome,	75
Measures taken by the Council of Trent for the Suppression of the Bible, and other " <i>Prohibited Books</i> ,"	76

THE INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORIUM AND EXPURGATORIUM—

These Indices Explained,	76
Excerpts from the Indices,	77
Suppression and Restoration of Martini's Bible by Pius VI. and Pius VII. respectively,	78
Dens' Theology quoted on the Policy of Popery in relation to the Bible,	78
Priest Balmez quoted on the Restrictions put on the Bible in Spain,	78
Alphonsus a Castro quoted to the same effect,	79
Comprehensive Rule regulating the Policy of Popery in relation to the Use of the Bible,	79
The Policy of Popery in relation to the Bible summarily reduced to Five Heads, viz.—	
1. Rome's Claim to the Exclusive Right to Interpret the Sacred Volume,	79
2. Her Adulteration of the Canon by her Apocryphal Books,	80
3. Falsification of the Text, according to Examples given,	80
4. Falsification of the Bible by Inaccurate and Perverted Quotations, as exemplified,	80
5. Depreciation and Vilification of the Sacred Word,	81
Defamatory Deliverances of the Pope against the Scriptures, and why?	81

EXCERPT FROM BULL OF PIUS VII., 1816—

Bible Societies, according to the Excerpt, are a "Pestilence,"	81
--	----

	PAGE
EXCERPT FROM BULL OF LEO XII., 1824—	
The Excerpt Declares that the Protestant Scriptures are “the Gospel of the Devil,”	81
EXCERPTS FROM BULL OF GREGORY XVI., 1832—	
The Excerpts pronounce against “the Detested Liberty of the Press,”	81
The Productions of the Press opposed to Popery are “Bad Books,” which can be no otherwise de- stroyed than by <i>the flames</i> ,	82
EXCERPTS FROM BULL OF GREGORY XVI., 1844—	
Bible Societies Condemned for Labouring to “Dissemi- nate the Holy Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue,” .	82
The Invention of Printing charged with aiding the Circulation of the Bible,	82
Former Decrees “against the Scriptures” confirmed, .	83
EXCERPT FROM ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF PIUS IX., 1847—	
The Encyclical condemns “Insidious Bible Societies,”	83
POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE THIRD ARTICLE OF THE CREED—	
The Article quoted,	83
“Paradise Lost” quoted,	84
Simony (a Crime deriving its Name from <i>Simon Ma-</i> <i>gus</i>) far excelled in Wickedness by the Religious Traffic of the Papacy—Simon’s Crime was a Wish to “ <i>Purchase the Grace of God</i> ,”—Popery <i>Sells</i> it, .	84
St Peter’s Name desecrated by the Tax called “Peter’s Pence,”	85
The Pope’s Sacraments the Special Merchandise of the Papacy,	85
How the Priest may defraud the Buyer of a Sacra- ment,	85
DOGMA OF SACRAMENTAL INTENTION—	
The Constitution of a Romish Sacrament explained, .	86
The Council of Trent on the Sacrament of the Eucha- rist,	86
The Council of Trent on the Doctrine of “Intention,”	86
The Council of Trent certifies that the Absolution of a Priest may be given “in Jest,”	86
Sarpi quoted on the Practice of <i>Jocular Absolutions</i> , .	87
Catechism of the Council of Trent on the “Form of a Sacrament,”	87

The <i>Missale Romanum</i> , or Roman Missal, quoted on the Doctrine of Intention,	87
Dens quoted on the Doctrine of Intention,	88
How the Grace is put into a Romish Sacrament,	88
Certainty that "Defects" of Intention <i>do</i> occur,	89
Blanco White's Case referred to,	89
Bellarmino quoted to show that no one can know the Priest's "Intention,"	90

CONSEQUENCES FLOWING FROM THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION—

Involves the Absurdity that we must know "one Im- possibility multiplied by an Innumerable Series of others!"	90
A Requirement which "Doubles the Last Product of multiplied Impossibilities!"	90
The Popish Church the only <i>Invisible Church on Earth</i> ,	91
Donovan's Catechism quoted,	91

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION—

Political Aims associated with the Doctrine of Inten- tion,	91
The Doctrine of Intention no longer depended on for Political Objects,	92
The Pope now withholds the Sacraments altogether from his Political Foes,	92
The Case of the Italian Minister, Santa Rosa, referred to,	93

ROMISH BAPTISM—

Romish Baptism made a Basis for the Support of the Pope's Temporal Power,	94
--	----

POPISH HOMOLOGATION OF HERETICAL BAPTISM—

Council of Trent quoted on do.,	94
Catechism of the Council of Trent quoted on do.,	94

POPISH OBLIGATIONS OF HERETICAL BAPTISM—

Council of Trent quoted on do.,	95
The Cause of the Pope's Liberality in consenting to ac- knowledge the Validity of Heretical Baptism,	95

PENAL OBLIGATIONS OF HERETICAL BAPTISM—

The Council of Trent quoted on do.,	95
Catechism of the Council of Trent quoted on do.,	95
Dens' Theology quoted on do.,	95
Dens further quoted on do.,	95

	PAGE
Delahogue, a Maynooth Class-book, quoted on do., .	97
Bailly, another Maynooth Class-book, quoted on do., .	97
ROMISH DOCTRINE OF COMPULSORY BAPTISM—	
Definition on the Subject by Pope Innocent III., .	97
Ferraris on Innocent's Definition quoted, . . .	98
The Mortara Case referred to,	98
Defence of Mortaraism by the <i>Tablet</i> newspaper, .	98
The Baptismal Principles of Rome defended by the <i>Tablet</i> ,	100
POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE SPONSORIAL SYSTEM OF THE PAPACY:—	
Catechism of the Council of Trent quoted, . . .	101
Papal Impediments to Marriage created by the Doctrine of "Spiritual Affinity,"	101
THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE—	
Baptism and Penance the Exclusive Channels of Popish Justification,	102
Difference between Baptismal and Penitential Justification,	102
MORTAL AND VENIAL SIN—	
The Distinction of Mortal and Venial Sin disproved, .	102
The Relation of Venial Sin to Social Criminality, .	103
The Moral Law of the Papacy in Collision with the Civil Law of the State,	104
BAILLY ON THE SIN OF "VENIAL" THEFT—	
Quotation from his " <i>Theologica Dogmatica et Moralis</i> ,"	104
Various Instructions of Bailly for the Sinless Commission of Venial Robbery,	104
Particular Instruction in relation to the Lawful Commission of Venial Theft by Wives, &c.,	105
VENIAL SIN, AS EXPOUNDED IN THE ROMISH WORK CALLED "WHAT EVERY CHRISTIAN MUST KNOW"—	
Various Quotations and Strictures on the Teaching of this Work,	106
Bailly's Teaching echoed by "What every Christian must Know and Do,"	106
Various additional Quotations from do. commented on,	107, 108

Necessary Evil Results of making the Moral Law of the Papacy the Basis of Criminal Legislation in Romish States,	109
--	-----

PENANCE NO SACRAMENT—

Anomalous Character of this Sacrament,	110
Catechism of the Council of Trent quoted on the “Matter” of this Sacrament,	111
Absurdities contained in the Quotation exposed,	111
The “Exhaustless Anomalies” of Penance,	112
Misapplication of the term <i>Confessor</i> for <i>Confessionist</i> to the Romish Priests, ,	113
The Absolving Priest usurping the Judgment-Seat of Christ,	113

THE CONFESSIONAL—

The Institution of Confession specially adapted to the Promotion of the Secular Aims of Popery,	114
Illustration of the various Forms in which the Priest employs the Confessional to promote the Interests of the Papacy,	115
Aggravated Evils resulting from the Joint Influence of Celibacy and the Confessional,	116

CONFESSIONAL TRAINING OF THE PRIEST—

The Text-books for the Confessional Training of Priests Sinks of Beastly Obscenity,	116
Translations of Dens and Liguori on Confessional Train- ing referred to,	116

CONFESSIONAL TRAINING OF THE PENITENT—

Training Manuals in this Department of the Confes- sional referred to and exposed,	117
Sins of <i>Omission</i> never confessed by Romanists, and why?	117

CONFESSIONAL INTERCOURSE OF PRIEST AND PENITENT—

The Priest compared to a Cross-Examiner in a Divorce Court	118
Evils resulting from the Confessional by the Secret Intercourse of Opposite Sexes,	118
The Confessional a great Source and Propagater of the “Social Evil,”	119
Apologetic Reference to Scotch Illegitimacy,	119
Pre-Reformation Profligacy of the Scottish Priesthood,	120

Reeve's Church History quoted on the Priestly Profligacy of the Eleventh Century,	120
Superlative Profligacy of the Spanish Priesthood,	121
Quotation from the Bull of Pius IV. anent the Contemporary Debauchery of the Spanish Confessional,	121
Elliot's "Delineation of Romanism" quoted on the Total Futility of the Pope's Bull in the Case,	122

SEAL OF THE CONFESSIONAL—

Dens quoted on "the Seal,"	124
Delahogue quoted on the same,	124

THE SEAL DISPENSABLE FOR THE GOOD OF THE CHURCH—

Varied Quotations from Dens on this Point commented on,	125, 126
---	----------

COMPULSORY OBLIGATIONS OF THE CONFESSIONAL—

The Right of the Church to "employ Force" decided by Pius IX.	127
The Fourth Council of Lateran on the Obligation to Confess Once a Year,	128
Connexion between the Canonical Obligations of Penance and Baptism referred to,	128
The Confessional in the Ecclesiastical States, or "Peter's Patrimony,"	128
Abbé Fleury quoted on the Confessional in Spain,	128
Another Witness quoted on the Modern Practice of the Confessional in Spain,	129
Decline of the Pope's Power to "employ Force,"	129

PROGRESS OF THE CONFESSIONAL IN BRITAIN—

Quotation from the <i>New York Christian Times</i> —the State of the Confessional the "Touchstone" of Popish Progress or Decline,	131
Quotation from the <i>Union</i> , a Tractarian Organ, on the Confessional in the Church of England,	131
Later Manifestations on the Subject,	131
The Canon Law of the Church of England quoted,	131
Canon Law of the Church of England not confirmed by any Parliamentary Statute,	132

COLLISIONS BETWEEN THE OPERATIONS OF THE CONFESSIONAL AND CIVIL LAW—

The Civil Law on the Concealment of Crime,	132
--	-----

Four Points in which the Confessional opposes the Civil Law,	132
An Illustration in reference to the <i>first</i> of these Cases derived from the Rev. L. J. Nolan, a Converted Priest,	3
Quotation from his Pamphlet,	133
Pardon of Future or Contemplated Sin in the Confessional,	133
Diversion of Civil Justice by the Confessional,	134
Illustrative Reference to the <i>Second</i> of the above Cases derived from the Testimony of the Rev. J. Burnett before the Lords' Committee,	134
Illustrative Reference to the <i>Third</i> of the above Cases derived from a Durham Trial,	135
The <i>Times</i> quoted on the Case,	135
The Law receives no Security for the Priest's Honesty in the Reception of Stolen Goods through the Confessional,	136
Liguori quoted on the Dishonesty of Priests through the Confessional,	136
Illustration of the <i>Fourth</i> of the above Cases from the Trial of Priest M'Laughlan of Eastmuir, Glasgow,	137
Quotations from Newspaper Comments on the Case of Priest M'Laughlan,	137
Letter on the Case addressed to the Editor of the <i>Daily Review</i> , by an Edinburgh "Controversial Missionary,"	138-142
Illustrations from the Case of the "Road Murder,"	142
Constance Kent and her Puseyite Confessionist, the Rev. A. D. Wagner,	143
CONFESSORIAL DIRECTORSHIP—	
The Office of Confessorial Director explained,	143
Dens' Theology quoted on the Office, !.	143
Michelet's "Priests, Women, and Families" quoted,	144
POLITICAL APPLICATIONS OF THE CONFESSORIAL—	
Advantages of the Confessorial to the Political Papacy,	145
Priest M'Corry quoted on the Political Skill of the "Roman Court,"	145
Comments on Priest M'Corry's Statements,	146
Quotation from the "Incidents in the Life of an Italian Priest,"	147

CIVIL OBLIGATIONS OF THE CONFESSIONAL IN THE PAPAL STATES—

The Fourth Council of Lateran quoted on the Compulsory Obligation of Annual Confession, . . .	147
The Pope's <i>Compulsory Pardon</i> . . .	147
Quotations from "Rome in the Nineteenth Century,"	147, 148
Quotation from Sir Culling Eardley's "Romanism of Italy,"	148
The Pope's Polyglot Machinery for the Discovery of the Political Secrets of Foreign Courts, . . .	149
The "Directorship" of the Confessional, . . .	149

THE KING'S CONFESSOR—

Quotations Illustrating the Origin and Influence of that Office,	150, 151
--	----------

THE ACT OF ABSOLUTION—

Significations of the Term Absolution,	151
Heaven made Subject to Earth, or God made Subject to the Priest's Absolution,	151
Absolution the Climax of Papal Usurpation,	152
The Revelments of the Confessional is <i>Knowledge</i> — Absolution <i>Power</i> —in relation to the Pursuits of Priestly Avarice and Ambition,	152
The Joint-Influence of Confession and Absolution in Relation to <i>Wills</i> , Illustrated by a quotation from the <i>Bulwark</i> ,	153

RESERVED ABSOLUTION—

Absolution from certain Sins reserved to the Bishop, Archbishop, or the Pope, according to their Degree of Turpitude in the Eyes of the Papacy,	153
The Council of Trent quoted on the Point,	153
Reserved Absolutions have Special Reference to Sins against the Pope's <i>Political</i> Power,	153
Such Absolutions commonly associated with Excommunications, Suspensions, Interdicts, &c.,	154
Henry IV.'s Absolution Reserved to Gregory VII.,	154
Reserved Absolution of the King of France to Pope Celestine II.,	154
Reserved Absolution of Frederick Barbarossa to Pope Alexander III.,	154
Absolution of the Government and Nation of England by the Pope's Representative, Cardinal Pole, in the reign of Mary,	154
Quotation from Cobbett on the Case,	155

THE PENITENTIARIES—

Reserved Absolutions so multiplied as to create the Necessity for Special Officers, called <i>Penitentiaries</i> ,	155
M'Ghee's "Laws of the Papacy" quoted on the Major Penitentiary,	155
The Bull <i>Pastor Bonus</i> quoted on the Prerogatives of the <i>Major Penitentiary</i> ,	156

PENANCES—

Penances the Price which a Roman Catholic pays to God for his Pardon,	156
Arbitrary Power of the Priest in the Imposition of Penance,	156
Mosheim quoted on the Papal Imposition of Pecuniary Mulcts as a Substitution for Penances,	157

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PENITENTIAL SYSTEM—

Process by which Penances were Originated,	158
Mosheim quoted on the Subject,	158
Guizot's "History of Civilisation in Europe" quoted on the Point,	158
Congregational Confession—Penance and Absolution transformed by the Papacy into the Penitential Sacrament—Public Penances reserved to such as had violated the Pope's Authority,	159

THE CONFESSIONAL IN THE PRESENT DAY HISTORY OF THE
PAPACY—

Judgments pouring out on the Papacy,	160
The Pope enlisting the "Secular Arm" of Brigandage —Cardinal Antonelli's Brigand Parentage,	160

EXTRACTS FROM SIGNOR MASSARI'S REPORT TO THE ITALIAN
GOVERNMENT—

Identity of Brigandage with the Interests of the Papacy,	162
Further Extracts, including the Examination of a Bri- gand Prisoner,	162
Further Extracts, including the Complicity of the Monks with Brigandage,	163
Nicolini's "History of the Pontificate of Pius IX." re- ferred to,	163
Quotation from Nicolini on the Employment of the Confessional in the Political Intrigues of the Papacy,	164

"Irish and English Prelates" implicated in Treasonable Intercourse with Rome,	164
The Influence of the Confessional in disseminating Moral Corruption,	165
Power of the Confessional in Political Relations,	165

DUTY OF CIVIL GOVERNMENTS IN RELATION TO THE CONFESSIONAL—

The Question, Whether the Civil Power has a Right to Deal Coercively with the Confessional depends upon the Question, Whether the Confessional is a Religious or Political Institution,	166
The Confessional Shown to be a purely Secular Organisation,	167
Pretentious Blasphemy, that the Priest hears Sin <i>as God</i> ,	167
The True Character in which the Priest hears Sin,	167
Toleration of the Confessional a Singular Political Insanity,	168

LEGAL SUPPRESSION OF THE ENGINE OF PRIESTCRAFT CALLED THE CONFESSIONAL—

The Confessional the Great Successful Engine for the Propagation of Papal Despotism,	168
W. E. Baxter, M.P., quoted to this effect,	168
Duty of States in Relation to the Suppression of the Confessional,	169

LEGAL SUPPRESSION OF CONFESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS—

Demoralising Vileness of Rome's Confessional Publications invokes their Suppression by the Civil Ruler,	169
Michelet's "Priests, Women, and Families" quoted on this point,	169
The Confessional Publications of Dens and Liguori are Violations of Present-day Statute Law,	170
Imperative Duty of Governments to Protect Society from Rome's Debauching Publications,	170

POLITICAL RELATIONS OF CONFIRMATION—

The Political Relations of Confirmation, and their Connexion with those of Baptism,	171
Partial Recapitulation of the Political Relations of Baptism,	171

	PAGE
Confirmation <i>ratifies</i> all the Political Relations of Baptism, and makes the Confirmed a <i>self</i> -pledged Subject of the Pope's Political Power,	171
The "True Obedience" which every Romanist, by the Creed of Pope Pius IV., pledges himself to yield to the Pope, only to be Interpreted by the Pope himself,	172
The Political and Social Relations which spring from the Sponsorial Associations of Confirmation,	172
Catechism of the Council of Trent quoted on the Point,	172
The Catechism an Inaccurate Expositor in the Case,	172
Sponsorial Obligations Removable by <i>Dispensations</i> ,	173
THE ROMISH EUCHARIST—	
Political and Social Influences involved in the Doctrine of the Eucharist,	173
The Doctrine of Transubstantiation Innovated by Innocent III.,	173
DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION—	
The Evidence which would Prove Transubstantiation would leave it impossible to Prove Christianity,	174
First Step in the Process of this Development a "Spiritual Presence,"	174
Second Step in the Process—a "Corporeal Presence,"	174
The Doctrine First Received Theological Shape from Paschasius Radbert,	175
Host of Contemporary Opposers of Radbert's New Dogma,	175
The Doctrine Established by the Fourth Council of Lateran, 1215,	175
Perfected in its Definition by the Council of Trent,	175
REGULATIONS OF THE MISSAL ON THE SUBJECT OF THE MASS—	
Selected Specimens of these Regulations Supplied in a Series of Quotations from the Missal,	176
SUNDRY DEVELOPMENTS RESULTING FROM TRANSUBSTANTIATION—	
Tendency of One Development to Beget Others not Anticipated or Desired by the Papacy,	176
DEVELOPMENT OF WAFER COMMUNION—	
Rome's Reasons for Adopting the Wafer instead of the Ordinary Bread of the Sacrament,	177
Scripture Contradictions involved in the Change,	177

	PAGE
DEVELOPMENT OF HALF COMMUNION—	
Causes Originating the Adoption of Half Communion,	178
The Doctrine of Half Communion perhaps the only Romish Dogma in which the Papacy has erred on the side of " <i>Subtraction</i> instead of Multiplication,"	178
DEVELOPMENT OF FASTING COMMUNION—	
Christ Administered the Communion after a <i>Feast</i> , the Pope only administers it after a <i>Fast</i> ,	179
Romish Reasons for the Change,	179
DEVELOPMENT OF HOST WORSHIP—	
Wafer Worship a Necessary Result of Transubstantia- tion,	179
The Doctrine of "Intention" puts the Romish Wor- shipper of the Host in the same category with the Samaritan [Idolaters, to whom Christ said, "Ye worship ye know not what," (John iv. 22,)	179
DEVELOPMENT OF THE MASS—	
The Mass as defined in the Creed of Pius IV.,	179
Declared to be same Sacrifice as that of the Cross, so that every Mass is a fresh Act of Redemption on the part of Christ,	180
DEVELOPMENT OF A SACRIFICING PRIESTHOOD—	
A Real Sacrifice necessitated a Real Sacrificer,	180
Aspirations after the Priest's Office a Key to the Extra- ordinary Zeal of Priestcraft in relation to Transub- stantiation, upon which that Office depends,	180
DEVELOPMENT OF INFIDELITY FROM THE DOGMA—	
Transubstantiation an equal Stumbling-block to the Conversion of the Heathen, the Mohammedan, and the Jew,	181
Quotation from Overroes, a heathen philosopher,	181
Quotation from M. L. Boulay,	181
Quotation from the Book of Baruch,	181
Transubstantiation a Miracle transcending the Incarna- tion,	182
Jealousy of the Papacy in relation to any Denial of this Dogma,	182
Latimer, Ridley, and a host of Reformers Sacrificed to the Dogma,	183

	PAGE
ROYAL AND PARLIAMENTARY DECLARATION AGAINST THE DOGMA—	
The Declaration quoted,	183
Fatuitous Removal of the Declaration by the "Relief Act,"	183
TRANSUBSTANTIATION A CLEAR VIOLATION OF STATUTE LAW AGAINST THE CRIME OF BLASPHEMY—	
Blasphemy Defined,	183
"National Encyclopædia" quoted on Blasphemy,	183
Blackstone quoted on do.,	184
Scotch and English Law assimilated in relation to the Crime,	184
Query concerning the Blasphemy of Transubstantiation, Bishop Burnett quoted on some Profane Associations of the Dogma,	184
Transubstantiation pronounced Blasphemous by the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England,	185
Transubstantiation obnoxious to the Penalties of Blasphemy as defined by British Law,	185
Question touching the Right of Political Legislation to rank Blasphemy as a Political Crime,	185
The Question answered in the Affirmative,	186
EXTREME UNCTION—	
Brief Exposition of the Rite,	187
The Council of Trent quoted on,	187
Perversions of Scripture to Establish this Sacrament,	187
Bishop M'Hale's Falsification of the Divine Text exposed,	188
The Passage in James v. 14 refutes instead of supporting the Dogma,	188
The <i>Practice</i> of Rome herself refutes the Dogma,	189
DEVELOPMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION—	
The Doctrine of Development necessitates a new form of dealing with Romish Errors,	189
The Gospel of Mark quoted on the point,	189
Cessation of Miraculous Powers in the Church, When and Why?	190
This Cessation early left the Elders of the Primitive Church unable to comply with the Institution of James v. 14,	190
Transformation of James's Institution into a Sacrament,	190

	PAGE
Reasons why the Institution of James cannot refer to Sin,	191
Straits to which Romanists are put to make the Institution of James apply to <i>Venial Sin</i> ,	191
Priest Keenan's Mode of dealing with the Difficulty, .	191
His edited "Catechism of the Christian Religion" quoted,	192
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE DOGMA—	
Deathbed Exactions associated with Extreme Unction, .	192
Inefficacy of the Mortmain Law to counteract these exactions, and Why?	192
Transmutations of Penitential into Pecuniary Satisfaction,	193
Will-making associated with Extreme Unction,	194
Social and Civil Evils of this so-dubbed Sacrament, . .	194
Dr Begg's Hand-Book of Popery quoted on Popish Wills,	194
The <i>Daily News</i> quoted on do.,	195
The <i>Catholic Layman</i> referred to on Priestly Deathbed Frauds,	195
ORDERS—	
The "Orders" of Rome, What?	196
Priest Keenan quoted on the Episcopal Order,	196
The Seven Orders of Rome shown to be so many <i>different Sacraments</i> instead of one,	196
St Jerome says the Episcopacy is derived from the "instigation of the Devil,"	196
Reversion of the Official Relations between Priests and Bishops as regards the function of Ordination, . .	196
The Douay Bible quoted and commented on in relation to this point,	197
Orders no Sacrament,	197
Jeremiah quoted,	198
DEVELOPMENT OF POPISH ORDERS—	
Offices and Dogmas alike developed in Popery,	198
Mutual Relations of Laity and Clergy corrupted by the Papacy and its followers,	199
The True Relationship exactly reversed by the Papacy, .	199
Priestly Usurpation of the term Church,	199
The Mutual Relations of the Officials and Laity in the Jewish Church not perpetuated in the Christian Church,	199

	PAGE
Galatians iv. 1, 2, quoted to the point,	199
1 Pet. v. 1-3, quoted to the same effect,	199
Importance of the word "heritage," as used by the Apostle Peter,	200
Signification and False Application of the word Clergy, which signifies the <i>Laity</i> !	200
Popish corruption of Scripture in relation to the word,	201
Similar Corrupted Application of the term Priest, or Sacrificer,	201
1 Pet. ii. 5 quoted to prove that the <i>Laity</i> are the Priest- hood of the Church,—The term Priest, or Sacrificer, being never applied to a New Testament <i>Official</i> ,	201
Considerations Accounting for the Development of the Priestly Orders of Popery,	202, 203
Political Relations of Priesthood and Priestcraft,	204
Prejudicial Influence of Ecclesiastics in the Jewish Church,	204
Superior Social and Political Evils associated with the Popish Hierarchy,	204
Warnings of Paul against the Apostasy of the <i>Officials</i> of the Church,	204
Acts xx. 28 quoted to the point—2 Pet. ii. 1 quoted to the same effect,	205
Priesthood Distinguished by Pre-eminent Wickedness, and Why?	205
Priestcraft commented on,	205
The Political Design of the Papacy in the Creation of "Orders,"	206

INSTITUTION OF CELIBACY—

Inconsistency of Romanism in Constituting Matrimony a <i>Holy</i> Sacrament, and Prohibiting its Priesthood to Participate in its Holiness,	207
The State of Celibacy cunningly designated a "State of Chastity,"	207
The Council of Trent quoted "on the Mode of Pro- ceeding against Clerics who keep Concubines,"	207
Reverence to the Romish Perversions of Scripture in Support of Celibacy,	207
1 Tim. iii. on the point,	208
The Annotators of the Douay Bible quoted and refuted on the same subject,	209

	PAGE
1 Tim. iii. compared with 1 Tim. iv. 3 on the same subject,	209
Marriage Falsely Interpreted "a Great Sacrament" in Eph. v. 32, Douay Bible,	210
Reason why Rome designates Celibacy, <i>Chastity</i> ,	210
1 Cor. vii. 2 quoted,	210
1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, quoted,	210
Marriage Especially Incumbent on the Romish Priesthood,	211
Celibacy Adopted on Popish Principles, simply a Rejection of Marriage to Indulge in Fornication,	211
Slow Growth of the Development of Celibacy,	211
THE POLICY OF CELIBACY—	
Procedure of the Council of Trent on the point,	211
Historical References on the point,	212
Edgar's "Variations of Popery" quoted on the subject,	212
Gieseler's "Ecclesiastical History" quoted on the Taxes Paid by Priests for Liberty to Keep Concubines,	212
Priestly Origin of the Great <i>Pathological</i> Evil of the "Social Evil,"	213
Gieseler again quoted on the point,	213
MONASTIC ORDERS—	
Popish Perversion of Scripture in Support of Monks,	214
The Two Systems of Romish Orders, or the <i>Secular</i> and <i>Regular</i> Clergy,	214
Monks and Friars distinguished,	215
Various Distinctions of Monastic Orders explained,	215
COUNSELS OF PERFECTION—	
Pseudo-Scriptural Foundation of Monks,	216
Rhemish Testament Annotation on Matt. xix. 12,	216
Do. on Luke x. 42,	216
Vows have no Positive Institution in Scripture,	216
COUNSEL AND VOW OF MONKISH CHASTITY—	
Canon of the Council of Trent on the subject,	217
Different Representations of Scripture and Popery on Chastity,	218
The Council of Trent quoted on the Canonical Age of Celibates,	218
COUNSEL AND VOW OF MONASTIC POVERTY—	
<i>Sacred</i> Poverty quite consistent with <i>Secular</i> Wealth,	219

	PAGE
Monkish Acquisition of Wealth by <i>Pious Frauds</i> ,	219
Hone's "Ancient Mysteries" referred to,	219
D'Aubigne quoted on Monkish Life,	219
Wm. Cobbett quoted on Monkish Imposture,	220
Monastic Wealth the Occasion of the Overthrow of Monastic Establishments,	220
Absurd Consequences flowing from the Popish Distinc- tion between "Commands" and "Counsels,"	220
Romish Perversion of Scripture in Support of Monkery exposed,	221
2 Thes. iii. 10 quoted against Monastic Beggary,	222

THE COUNSEL AND VOW OF MONKISH OBEDIENCE—

Monkish "Obedience" explained,	222
Cardinal Wiseman quoted on the necessity of Unquali- fied Submission to the Romish Priesthood,	223
Twofold Distinction in Monastic Obedience,	223
The Trial of Fitzgerald <i>v.</i> Northcote referred to,	224

MONASTIC PRISONS—

Monastic Prisons the Disciplinary Barracks for the "Regulars" of the Pope's Ecclesiastical Forces,	225
Priest Lacordaire quoted on the point,	225
Decree of the Council of Trent on Monastic Imprison- ment,	225
The Council quoted on the Compulsory Imprisonment of Monastics,	226
Collisions of the Monastic Law with Civil Law,	227
Rev. H. Seymour quoted on Monastic Robbery,	227
Poetical Fancy which describes a Nun's Conventual Capital as a Dowry given to Christ,	227
Examination of Cardinal Wiseman before the Mort- main Committee,	228
His Revelations and Concessions Analysed,	229

SCRIPTURAL NUNNERIES—

Ephraim Chambers's Encyclopædia quoted on the term Nun,	229
1 Tim. v. 9 quoted,	229
The Scriptures on the Institution of Deaconesses,	230
Council of Laodicea referred to on the point,	230
Calmet's "Biblical Dictionary" quoted on the subject,	231
Mosheim's Testimony,	231
Kitto's "Biblical Cyclopædia" quoted,	231

The Apostle Paul "Concerning Virgins, had no Commandment of the Lord,"	232
--	-----

DEVELOPMENT OF MONASTICISM—

<i>Subjective and Objective</i> causes of Development distinguished,	232
Mosheim quoted on the Origin of Monastery,	233
Twofold form of Self-righteousness,	233
<i>Moral Cowardice</i> among the Causes of Monastery,	234
St Antony on the Advantages of Monastic Seclusion,	234
Monastic Seclusion shown to be a Source of Temptation instead of a Remedy against it,	234

INDIVIDUAL MONASTICISM—

The "Breviary" quoted on Paul, the Founder of Monastery,	235
The Development of Individual Monastery further traced,	236

CONGREGATIONAL MONKERY—

The "Breviary" quoted on the Introduction of the System by St Antony,	236
Political Consequences of Monastery to the Emperor of Rome,	237
Further Development of Congregational Monastery by Pachomius,	237

DENOMINATIONAL MONKERY, OR MONKISH ORDERS—

Monkish Orders Originated by Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea,	237
Monkish Orders extended to the Western Church by St Benedict,	238

RIVALRY BETWEEN THE REGULAR AND SECULAR ORDERS—

The Regular deprive the Secular Clergy of their Popularity,	238
Consequent Oppression of Monastery by the Episcopacy,	238
Interposition of the Papacy in Favour of Monastery,	238

MILITARY ORDERS—

Development of the Pope's Monkish Military,	239
"Political Philosophy" of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge quoted to the point,	240
The Principal Orders of Military Monastery enumerated,	240

MENDICANT ORDERS—


Origin of the Mendicant Orders by St Dominick and St Francis,	241
---	-----

	PAGE
Mendicant Monks Homologated by Innocent III., .	241
The Dominicans charged by Innocent with the Care of the Inquisition,	241
Mendicant Monks become the most successful of all in the Acquisition of <i>Wealth</i> ,	241
Reference to Waddington's "Church History" on the point,	242
The Pomp and Profligacy of the Mendicants the Source of the First Movement towards the Reformation,	243
ORDER OF THE JESUITS—	
The Knowledge of Jesuitism a Special Desideratum in the Study of Romanism,	243
The Professed Followers of Jesus the Real Followers of Judas,	244
ORIGIN AND OBJECT OF THE ORDER OF THE JESUITS—	
Brief Account of Ignatius Loyola—Popish Comparison between Luther and Loyola, as the respective Champions of Protestantism and Popery	245
Rev. xii. 7 quoted,	245
CONSTITUTION AND PECULIARITIES OF THE JESUITS—	
Criteneau Joly quoted on Ignatius,	246
Pascal's "Provincial Letters" quoted on the same,	246
The Constitution of Jesuitism an Entire Departure from other Forms of Monks,	247
INSTITUTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JESUITS—	
Application for his Order by Ignatius to Paul III.,	247
The Jesuits Chartered by Paul III., on condition of the Society binding itself to an unreserved Sub- jection to the Papacy,	247
Bull for the Establishment of the Jesuits,	247
The Four Disciplinary Distinctions in the Order of Jesuits; namely, <i>Novices, Scholars, Coadjutors</i> , and <i>Professors</i> ,	247
Process of Initiation into the Order,	248
SPIRITUAL EXERCISES OF ST IGNATIUS—	
Cardinal Wiseman's Edition of the "Spiritual Exer- cises" quoted,	248
The Court of Rome overreached by the Jesuits,	248
Obligations and Duties of the "Novices,"	248

	PAGE
Obligations and Duties of the "Scholars," . . .	249
Do. do. of the "Coadjutors," . . .	249
Do. do. of the "Professed," . . .	249
Duller's "Jesuits as they Were and Are" quoted on the Inauguration of the "Professed," . . .	250
Superior Advantages derived to the Jesuits by the Privileges of the Order,	250
The "Catholic Directory" of 1846 quoted on the Jesuit Privilege of adopting Disguise,	252
The Jesuits, Parsons and Campian, in the Reign of Elizabeth, commenced their Career as <i>Professed</i> <i>Protestants</i> ,	252
 MORAL PRINCIPLES OF THE JESUITS—	
General Principle originating Jesuit Morals, . . .	253
Notice of Blaize Pascal's Controversy with the Jesuits,	253
Origin of the Celebrated "Provincial Letters," .	254
Incident which led to the Public Discovery of the "Constitutions of the Jesuits,"	254
Chambers's Encyclopædia quoted to the point, . .	254
Nicolini's "History of the Jesuits" quoted, . . .	255
Pascal's "Letters" Verified by the Proceedings of the French Parliament against the Jesuits in 1761, .	256
The Book of the Constitutions quoted on several points,	256, 257
Principles of the Jesuits derived from the Works of their Individual Writers,	257
The Works of Individual Jesuits published by the Sanction of the Society,	257
The Constitutions quoted to this effect,	257
This Regulation secures the Validity of all Quotations from the Works of Individual Jesuits,	257
Collection of the Works of Individual Jesuits by the Parliament of Paris,	257
Publication by the Parisian Parliament of the Danger- ous Tenets of the Jesuits in the work—"Extraits des Assertions, Dangereuses et Pernicieuses," &c.,	258
Quotations from the "Extraits,"	258
Principles of the Jesuits derived from Romanists who are Non-Professional Jesuits, but yet advocates of Jesuitism,	258
Principles of the Jesuits thus Homologated by Alphon- sus Liguori,	258

Exposure of Liguori's Jesuitism by Pascal the Younger's "Cases of Conscience,"	259
The Jesuit Doctrine of Probability,	259
Summary of the Doctrine under three heads,	259
Collision between the Rules of Probability and Infal- libility,	259

SELECTIONS FROM THE "PROBABLE" DECISIONS OF JESUIT DOCTORS—

A Single Doctor's Authority makes an Opinion pro- bably right, and therefore safe to follow,	260
The Spiritual Power (the Pope) may Change or Dispose of Kingdoms,	260
Christians may not Tolerate a Sovereign who draws his Subjects to Heresy; the Pontiff possessing the Right to Judge in the Case, and to Determine whether the King must be deposed or not,	260
 This, a general rule of the Canon Law.	
The Tablet Newspaper referred to, to Prove it the Doctrine of the Papists of this Realm,	260
The Subject of any King may Kill him if Declared a Public Enemy by the Pope,	260
Assassins are those only who Commit a Homicide for <i>Temporal Reward</i> ,	260
It is Lawful to Kill an Individual Premeditating to Kill us,	260
An Individual who seeks to Ruin Another by False Impeachment may be Killed Secretly by the Party Impeached,	261
Servants are Secured both from Sin and Restitution if they only Steal an <i>Equitable</i> Compensation,	261
Servants may Act on their own <i>Private Judgment</i> in Compensating their own Work,	261
The Pope and his Prelates may Dispense with Vows,	261
The Pope can Dispense with Divine Laws,	261
A Confessor may Affirm on Oath that he has no Knowledge of a Crime revealed to him in the Confessional,	262
A Witness may Swear falsely when "unlawfully" In- terrogated,	262
Amphibology allowed in three forms,	262
Cases in which a Witness may withhold the Truth in Evidence, even when "Legitimately" Interrogated,	262

	PAGE
A Judge Bribed to induce him to give a False Verdict may Retain the Bribe,	263
This Opinion Held and Defended by fifty-eight Doctors,	263
A Judge may Pervert Judgment to serve his Friend, .	263
Confessors don't always do well to oblige their Peni- tents to make Restitution,	263
A Servant may Disobey a Superior who he <i>thinks</i> ex- ceeds his Authority,	263
An Opinion though False may be followed if Sanctioned by a sufficient Authority,	263
It is no Perjury to Confirm an Ambiguous Statement with an Oath,	263
When a Promiser thinks he has Reason to be Free from his Promise, he may Swear that he did not Promise,	263
We may Swear that we will do a Thing we do not In- tend to do,	263
Ecclesiastics, not being Subjects of the King, cannot be Convicted of Treason,	263
When a Royal Family become Heretics, a New Elec- tion to the Throne devolves on the State,	263
The Clergy Exempt from the King's Jurisdiction,	263
Ecclesiastics Exempt from all Lay Power,	263
 ACTS OF THE JESUITS—	
The Practical Morality of the Jesuits, derived from the Study of the Educational, Missionary, Mercan- tile, and Political Doings of the Society,	264
The Rev. H. Seymour's Work on "The Nature of Romanism, as Exhibited in the Missions of the Jesuits and other Orders," recommended,	264
Eulogiums bestowed by some Protestant Writers on the Missionary Career of the Jesuits, Decep- tive,	265
Principle of Jesuit Missionary Success explained,	265
The Principle Condemned by the Pope himself,	265
Bull quoted to that effect,	265
Mr Herbert Seymour's Pamphlet quoted,	265
Failure of the Jesuits in Japan occasioned by their Political Intrigues,	266
Quotations to that effect,	266
Japan Closed to Europe for Three Centuries through the Political Intrigues of the Jesuits in that Kingdom,	266

The <i>Dublin Review</i> (a Popish Organ) quoted to attest the Truth of Mr H. Seymour's Representations of Jesuit Missions,	267
The Jesuits Plying their Political Intrigues in this Kingdom,	267
Extract from the "Annales des Sainte Enfance," exhibiting the Carnal Character of Jesuit Missions, .	267
Importance of the Knowledge of the Educational Tactics of the Jesuits,	268
Dr Wylie's able Work on the "Awakening of Italy," quoted to the point,	268
Patronage of Jesuit Educational Works by the Privy Council,	268
The <i>Bulwark</i> quoted to the point,	268
The Jesuits as a <i>Trading Corporation</i> ,	269
The Sphere of <i>Politics</i> the Peculiar Arena of Jesuit Labours,	269
EXPULSION OF THE JESUITS FROM THE SEVERAL STATES OF EUROPE—	
<i>Quarterly Review</i> quoted to the point,	269
Formidable Number of their Political Banishments, .	269
Decree of France, in December 1594, referred to, .	270
Decree of Elizabeth, of November 1562, referred to, .	270
Decree for their Expulsion from Venice, in 1606, referred to,	270
De Thou, the French Ambassador at Venice, quoted to the point,	270
Decree of the King of Portugal, in 1769, referred to and quoted,	271
Ukase for their Expulsion from Russia, in 1820, referred to,	271
SUPPRESSION OF THE JESUITS BY "INFALLIBILITY"—	
Threatened Subversion of the Papacy itself by the career of the Jesuits,	271
Proposed Suppression of the Order by Clement XIII.,	271
Actual Suppression of the Order by Clement XIV., .	271
Extracts from the Brief for their Suppression, .	271
Suspicious Death of Clement as a Consequence, .	272
RESTORATION OF THE JESUITS—	
Pius VII. obliged to <i>Restore</i> the Jesuits to aid his Political Exigencies,	273

	PAGE
Bull "Solicitude Omnium" for the Restoration of the Jesuits, 7th August 1814,	273
The Bull initiated with the Falsehood "that the Catholic World had unanimously called for the Restoration of the Order,"	273
Quotation from the Bull alleging the Necessity of again Resorting to the aid of those "Vigorous and Experienced Rowers of the Barque of Peter,"	273
The Respective Bulls of three Popes for the <i>Institution</i> , the <i>Suppression</i> , and <i>Restoration</i> of the same Order, a singular exhibition of Infallible Inconsistency,	274
The Return of the Jesuits to their Treasonable Intrigues after their Restoration, necessitated a recurrence to their Political Expulsion from upwards of Thirty Kingdoms,	274
TESTIMONY OF THE LATE LORD PALMERSTON IN REFERENCE TO THE ORDER—	
Quotation from his Speech as Reported in the <i>Times</i> of April 23, 1853,	274
Articles of the Cession of Venetia to Italy include a Provision for the Expulsion of the Jesuits from Venice,	275
PRESENT DAY JESUIT INVASION OF BRITAIN—	
Open Violation of the "Relief Act" which Provides for "the Gradual and Final Suppression" of this Order of Britain,	275
The spreading Apostasy of the English Church attributable to Jesuit Agency,	275
Quotations from Dr Begg's Handbook to the point,	276
The Popish Missionary Operations of Edinburgh committed to the Management of Jesuits,	277
Generals of the Jesuits—their Office and Agency illustrated by quotation,	277
INCREDIBLE FACTS CONCERNING JESUITISM IN ENGLAND—	
A greater number of Jesuits in England than in Italy,	277
Quotation from Doctor de Sanctis's "Popery and Jesuitism at Rome,"	277

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL RELATIONS OF MONASTICISM—

Britain likely to become a Gigantic Monastery for the rest of the World,	278
The Experience of other Countries in reference to the Baneful Fruits of Monastery lost upon the British Nation,	279
Social and Political Relations of the Vows of Poverty, .	279
Monastic Trade in Relics,	279
Hume's Account of the Superstitious Offerings at the Shrine of Thomas à Becket,	280
New form of Monkish Traffic in France,	280
The "Press and St James's Chronicle" quoted in the case,	281
Social and Political Effects of Celibacy,	281
The Scripture Countenance given to the state of Celibacy on the part of Individuals cannot be Construed to Support the <i>Corporate</i> or Gregarious Celibacy of Monastery,	281
Effects of Monkish "Obedience" on the Loyalty of the Civil Subject,	281
Ignatius Loyola himself quoted to the point,	282
Various Civil and Social Anomalies resulting from the practice,	282
Britain Singular in Tolerating Conventual Prisons without Regard to State-inspection, and Control,	283
The whole System of Monastery not only Anti-Social but Anti-Constitutional in this Kingdom,	283

IMPERATIVE CALL FOR THE LEGAL SUPPRESSION OF MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS IN BRITAIN—

Suppression of Monastic Institutions in Continental States,	284
The Process of Monastic Suppression initiated by the Pope himself,	284
Quotation from "Aikman's History of Religions in England," showing the Reasons for this Procedure of the Papacy,	285
Henry VIII. warranted by the Pope's Example to pursue the same course,	285
Infatuated Policy of Britain in Tolerating an Institution which is being everywhere Suppressed in its own Continental Homes,	285

	PAGE
TESTIMONIES TO THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL EVILS OF MONASTICISM—	
Mistaken Defenders of Monkery among Protestants, .	285
Exposure of the Defences made,	286
Hume quoted in the case,	286
Southey quoted to prove the Corruption of Literature by the Monks of the Middle Ages,	286
Sir Richard Phillip's "Million of Facts," quoted to the same effect,	287
William Cobbet quoted in the case,	287
SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY—	
Theological Efforts of Rome to invest Matrimony with the Character of a Sacrament,	289
Romish Falsifications of Scripture to Support a Matri- monial Sacrament,	289
Evidence that the Marriage Union can in no way be identified with a Sacramental Ordinance,	290
The Marriage Union devoid of the Essentials of a Sacra- ment as defined even by Popery itself,	290
THE POPISH SACRAMENT OF MARRIAGE AND ITS ADJUNCTS, A DEVELOPMENT FROM HEATHENISM—	
Among the Jews Matrimony was regarded as a Civil Institution growing out of a Natural Relationship between the Sexes,	291
On the contrary, among the Heathens Marriage was treated as a <i>Religious</i> Ordinance,	291
Process by which the Matrimonial Sacrament became developed,	291
POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE SO-CALLED SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY—	
Jealousy of the Priests in reference to their Power to "Bind and Loose" the Marriage Tie,	292
The Council of Trent quoted on the Sacrament,	292
The Doctrine of <i>Intention</i> in its Bearings on Matri- mony,	292
Intention withheld by a Priest obliges a Married Couple to live in Mutual Adultery, and Bastardises their Children,	292
Canon III. of the Council of Trent quoted,	293
The above Canon overrides the Laws of God and Man in relation to Marriage,	293

Canon IV. of the Council of Trent quoted,	293
The above Canon, a further Violation of the Laws of God in relation to Divorce,	293
Canon XII. of the Council of Trent quoted on "Matri- monial Causes,"	294
The now famous "Syllabus" of Pius IX. quoted on the same,	294
Civil Popery against the Legislation of the Council of Trent and the Syllabus,	294
The Question whether the Pope's Pronouncements on the Subject of Marriage include the Marriages of <i>Protestants</i> or <i>Heretics</i> , examined and answered in the affirmative,	295
Reasons why the Marriage Contract should be exclu- sively regulated by the <i>Civil Power</i> ,	295

RITUALISM—

Romanists obliged by the Third Article of the Creed of Pius IV. to homologate the fantastic and tawdry Ceremonial of their Church,	296
The Jewish Ritual, its Symbolic Character, and its Fulfilment in the Realities of the New Testa- ment,	296
The Popish Ritual derived from Heathenism as attested by Dr Newman,	296

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RITUAL ELEMENT IN THE
PAPACY—

Ritualism one of the earliest Manifestations of the Apostasy,	296
Mosheim quoted on the Rise and Growth of Ecclesiastical Rites,	297
Ritualism devised not to Illustrate Christianity, but to cloak the Ignorance of the Priests,	297
Progressive Increase of Ritualism under the Patronage of Successive Popes,	297
Rev. G. Waddington referred to on the Gigantic Ritual- ism of the Greek Church,	298
Enumeration of the principal Books in which the Roman Ritual is detailed and explained,	298
Special Ritual Display of the Mass,	298
Enumeration of the 330 Ritual Forms of the Mass,	299
Lewis's "Bible, Missal and Breviary" referred to,	299

	PAGE
Ritualistic Flaggelations on the Continent illustrated by quotation from Thomson's "Facts from Rome,"	300
Seneca's pointed Sarcasm in reference to the Pagan Ritual of his day, quoted,	300
DEVELOPMENT OF RITUAL POPERY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND—	
The Leven of Ritualism unpurged from the Church of England at the Reformation,	300
The Recent Revival of this Element in the Church of England, an awkward and unsuccessful Mimicry of Popery,	301
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF RITUALISM—	
Ritualism Employed as a Means to Advance the Ambi- tious Designs of Priestcraft,	301
Influence of Ritualism in Creating Popular Delusion and Popular Subserviency to Priestly Authority, .	302
FOURTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.—	
The Article quoted,	302
The Justification of Romanism confined to the Sacra- ment of Baptism and Penance,	302
Peculiarities of Romish Justification explained, .	303
Imputed Righteousness Discarded by Romanism, .	
Rome's System of Justification by Infusion or by In- oculating Righteousness, explained,	303
2 Cor. 5, 21, quoted on Scriptural or True Justifica- tion,	303
Justification Defined to be an Exchange of Legal Rela- tions between Christ and the Sinner,	303
DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE—	
Early Tendencies to Justification by Works in the Gala- tian Churches,	304
The Galatian Apostates followed by the Priests of Rome,	304
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL BEARINGS OF THE DOGMA,	
Influence of Right Views of Religious Justification in Social and Political Morals,	304
Justification not by Works but by <i>Priests</i> , the Main Source of the Papal Usurpations and Influence, .	305
FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.—	
The Article quoted,	305

The Mass the most cunningly-devised of all Popish	
Impostures,	306
All the Virtues of the Sacraments and other Ordinances	
of Popery derived from the Mass,	306
Self-Refutation of the Mass in its own Definition—"the	
<i>Bloodless</i> Sacrifice of the Body and <i>Blood</i> of	
Christ,"	306
The Mass neither the Lord's Supper nor the Lord's	
Sacrifice,	307
Leaves the Sacrifice of the Cross as yet Uncompleted,	307
The Mass a Virtual Denial of the Atonement,	307
Man Justified and Saved by <i>one</i> Offering, <i>once</i> Offered	
and <i>once</i> Accepted,	307

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MASS—

Far-fetched Idea of Popery characterising Christ's In-	
stitutional Supper as "the First Mass,"	308
Scriptural Proof that Christ could have Offered no	
Sacrifice until He Offered Himself on the Cross,	308
Bellarmino's Allegement that the Ceremonies of the	
Mass took their Development from the Apostle	
Peter !	308
Gregory the Great's Part in the Concoction of the Mass,	308
Waddington's History of the Church quoted to this	
effect,	309
Pope Vitalian in the Seventh Century (666) Decrees	
that the Mass shall no longer be Celebrated in the	
Vernacular but in the Latin Tongue,	309
1 Cor. 14, 19, quoted against a Latin Mass,	309
Initiation of the Worship of the Host by Pope Hono-	
rius,	310
Initiation of the Bell-music of the Mass by Gregory IX.,	
Initiation of the Mass-feast called <i>Corpus Christi</i> by	
Pope Urban IV.	310
Mosheim quoted to this effect,	310
Quotation from the Council of Trent on the Feast,	311
Elliot's "Delineations" quoted on do.,	311
Doblada's "Letters from Spain" quoted on the same,	312
Comments on this Development of the Mass,	312

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL INFLUENCES OF THE DOGMA,

The Mass a Special Source of Homage, Wealth, and	
Power to the Priesthood,	313

	PAGE
The Mass virtually makes the Priest not only the Depository but the <i>Creator</i> of the Sinner's Salvation,	313
The Priest, the Creator of the Host, a fitter object of Worship than the Host, his Creature,	313
The Mass-trade the Great Source of Wealth to the Priesthood,	313
Quotation illustrating the present Mass-trade in Rome,	313
Futile Attempt of the Priests of this Kingdom to Defend the Mass-trade on the Plea of their Non-endowment, exposed,	314
Their Trade in "the Body of Christ" Constitutes the Popish Priesthood Successors to the Apostle Judas,	314
Persecuting Principle of Romanism especially Evoked by a Denial of the Mass,	314
The <i>unanswerable Argument</i> of the "Heretic," and not his Doctrine, that which calls forth the severest Persecutions of Popery,	315
Professor S. Morse of the University of New York quoted on the Celebration of Corpus Christi at Rome,	315
The Corpus Christi in Spain,	315
Weekly Register asserts that English Protestants deserve Insult and Assault for Refusing to Worship the Host there,	316

SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED—

Article quoted,	316
Antiquity of the Doctrine of Purgatory not Opposed but Conceded by Protestants,	317
Quotation from Virgil to prove that the Dogma existed before Christianity,	317
The Doctors of Trent observed a prudent Silence on the Nature and Effects of Purgatory,	317
Purgatory as Defined and Defended by Individual Teachers of the Church,	317
How Masses must Injure instead of Benefiting the Souls of Purgatory,	318
Priest Keenan's Attempt to support the Doctrine from Scripture noticed and exposed,	319
Perversion of Matt. v. 25, 26, to the support of a Purgatory,	319

All the Scriptures which Rome quotes to support this Dogma effectually <i>disprove it</i> ,	320
--	-----

DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOGMA—

The Doctrine of Purgatory drawn from the resources of Paganism,	321
First step towards the Development of a Purgatory in the Christian Church,	321
Prayer for the Dead in the Jewish and early Christian Church had reference to a <i>Resurrectional</i> and not a Purgatorial object,	322
2 Maccabees xii. 43, 44, quoted to this effect,	322
Perversion of the passage to the support of a Purga- tory refuted,	322
Tertullian quoted on the question of the Resurrec- tion,	322
His subsequent Heresy referred to,	322
Rome follows him, not in his Orthodoxy but in his <i>Heresy</i> ,	322
Origen's Purgatory incongenial to the aims of the Papacy, and therefore rejected,	323
Origen's Purgatory subsequently adopted with <i>modifi- cations</i> ,	323
Purgatory having no foundation in Scripture, nor even from Tradition, had to be supported and defended by an appeal to <i>Revelations from the Dead</i> ,	323
Gregory I. patronises this mode of establishing the Doctrine,	323
Mosheim quoted to the point,	323
Platina's account of Pope Benedict in Purgatory, . . .	324
St Bernard endorses Revelations from the Dead in sup- port of a Purgatory,	324
The "Golden Legend" quoted,	325
Cardinal Bellarmine quoted on Revelations from the Dead in support of Purgatory,	325
The Doctrine being thus popularly received, not upon Scripture or Tradition, but <i>Revelations from the Dead</i> , was established by the Council of Florence, . . .	326
Waddington's History of the Church quoted to this effect,	327
Confirmation of the Council of Florence on Purgatory by the decree of the Council of Trent,	327

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE DOGMA—

Grand Characteristic of all the Dogmas constituting the Creed of Pius IV.,	327
Purgatory, by the adroit teaching of Priests, is made at once the great <i>hope</i> as well as the great <i>fear</i> of the Laity,	327
Rev. John Burnett on the effects of the Doctrine in Ireland,	328
Virtual substitution of Purgatory for Hell a prolific source of Romish crime,	329
<i>Pelf</i> the great Aim of the Priests in the Encouragement and Propagation of this Superstition,	329
Guther's "Papist misrepresented," quoted and exposed,	033

DEVELOPMENT OF JOINT-STOCK PURGATORIAN SOCIETIES—

The "Quarterly Review" quoted on the First Established in this Country,	339
Purgatorian Society of St James's Parish, Dublin,	331
Rules of the Society quoted and commented on,	331

PURGATORIAN LOTTERIES— 332

Doblada's "Letters from Spain" quoted on the Subject,	332
---	-----

Theological Questions connected with Power of the Souls in Purgatory in Relation to their own Wants and those of the Living,	333
--	-----

Scheme of the Spanish Lottery described,	333
--	-----

PURGATORIAL SWINDLING— 333

Priestly Practice of receiving Payment for Masses which are never performed,	333
--	-----

Council of Trent obliged to Legislate against this Species of Swindling,	333
--	-----

PURGATORIAL LAWSUITS—

Prevalence of Purgatorial Influences in Spain,	334
Ingliš's "Spain in 1830," quoted on Purgatorial Law-suits, for Nonperformance of prepaid Masses,	334

DEATHBED POWER OF PURGATORY—

Power of this Engine of Priestcraft in the Deathbed Chamber,	335
The "History of Whitby" quoted to the point,	335
Dying Liberality of the Spanish Grandees,	335
Case of Philip II. quoted,	335

	PAGE
Henry VIII. a Dying Believer in the Mass,	335
The "Church Review" of Sept. 1865 quoted to the point,	336
SEVENTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED—	336
Article quoted,	336
Rev. v. 10 quoted on "the Saints Reigning with Christ,"	336
What the Church of Rome signifies by the term Saint,	337
Exclusively applied by Popery to <i>Dead</i> Christians, and only to <i>certain</i> of the Deceased Members of the Church whom the Pope distinguishes as entitled to the Character of Saints,	337
The Saints Reigning with Christ distinguished into Two Classes—the <i>Traditional</i> and <i>Canonical</i> ,	338
Peter's <i>Wife</i> no Saint in the Papal Estimation,	338
The Saints of the <i>Jewish Church</i> excluded from Romish Worship,	339
Angel Worship associated with Saint Worship,	339
<i>Latria</i> and <i>Dulia</i> Worship,	339
The Distinction verbally Refuted by the terms employed to express it,	339
Intercessional Office of the Saints referred to,	339
Heb. ii. 17, quoted and commented on against the Dogma,	340
Heb. ix. 24, quoted and commented on to the point,	340
DEVELOPMENT OF SAINT WORSHIP—	
First Step in the Growth of Saint Worship, viz., the Worship of <i>Angels</i> ,	341
Prayer for the Dead speedily succeeded by Prayer to the Dead,	342
Prayer to the Saints succeeded by Prayer to God through Saints,	342
<i>Missal of the Laity</i> quoted to the point of Prayer "through" Saints,	342
DEVELOPMENT OF CANONIZATION—	343
Development of Canonization a Special Stage in the Progress of Saint Worship,	343
Canonization designed to <i>Restrain</i> instead of <i>Promoting</i> Saint Worship,	343

	PAGE
Mosheim quoted on the subject,	343
Stages in the Development of Canonization,	344
Mosheim quoted on the subject,	345
Cardinal Wiseman's "Lives of Five Saints" quoted on the several Processes of Canonization,	345-350
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL INFLUENCES OF THE DOGMA—	
Popular Idleness created by Saint Worship,	351
Saint Days not merely a Source of Idleness but of De- bauchery and Crime,	351
<i>Cyril of Alexandria</i> quoted to the point,	351
The Canon Law referred to on Saint Day Legislation,	352
Quotation Exhibiting the Influence of Saint Days on the Social wealth of Spain,	353
Acts x. 25, 26, quoted on the subject of Saint Worship,	353
RELICS OF THE SAINTS—	
Relics Defined,	354
Relic Worship,	354
The Council of Trent quoted on Relic Worship,	354
Romish attempts to "Wrest the Scriptures" to this most degrading Worship, exposed,	355
DEVELOPMENT OF RELIC WORSHIP—	
Relics derived from neither Jews nor Gentiles, a Pure Invention of the Superstitious Instinct proper to the Papacy,	356
First Step in the Development, the care taken by the early Church of the Earthly Remains of the early Martyrs,	357
Calvin's "Treatise on Relics" quoted,	357
Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History referred to on the point,	357
The Practice of depositing Relics beneath the Altars of newly erected Churches noticed,	357
Gregory the Great quoted in his curious Correspond- ence on Relics with the Greek Empress,	357, 358
Miraculous Virtues ascribed to Relics,	359
Merchandise in Relics,	360
Mosheim quoted to the point,	360
Calvin's "Treatise on Relics" quoted,	361

THE CONGREGATION OF RELICS AT ROME—

The Roman Catacombs in connection with Relics referred to,	362
Eadie's "Ecclesiastical Cyclopaedia" quoted on the Process of Manufacturing a Saint,	362
Dr de Sanctis quoted on the Roman "Congregation of Relics,"	363

WORSHIP OF RELIC MODELS—

Facsimilies of the Chains of St Peter Manufactured and Sold in Rome. Quotations from Mr T. G. Owen on the case,	364
Quotations from the Roman Treatise on the Chains,	364

SOCIAL EVILS OF RELIC WORSHIP—

Superstitions and Frauds connected with the Practice,	364
Buck's Theological Dictionary quoted on the Statutes passed by the English Parliaments anent Relic Frauds,	366
Question as to the Application of these or similar Statutes to the Punishment of present day Relic-Robbery,	366

JOHN RONGE AND THE HOLY COAT OF TREVES,—	367
Illustrates the Mysteries of Relic Robbery,	367
Letter of Ronge quoted on the case,	367

EIGHTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED—

The Creed quoted,	369
"Paradise Lost" quoted,	369
Defect of the Article in Relation to the Doctrine designed to be expressed,	369
This defect supplied by a Reference to the Catechism of the Council of Trent,	369
The Principle of Christian and Romish Worship contrasted,	369
The Wording of the Seventh Article purposely obscure on the subject of Image Worship,	370
Difference between the Employment of Images as <i>Means</i> and <i>Objects</i> of Worship,	370
The Council of Trent referred to in explanation of the point,	370
Exposure of this dexterous Attempt to parry the Charge of Idolatry brought against the Church of Rome,	371

	PAGE
Exod. xxxii. 5, 6, quoted on the subject,	371
Judges xvii. 1-5 quoted,	372
Rome's further Arguments for Image Worship examined and exposed,	373
DEVELOPMENT OF IMAGE IDOLATRY—	
Rom. i. 21-23 quoted on the subject,	374
Processes of the Development summarily detailed,	375
Acts xix. 35 quoted on the case,	375
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DEVELOPMENT OF IDOLATRY—	
Renewed Consideration of the distinction between the Employment of Images as <i>Means</i> and as <i>Objects</i> of Worship,	376
DEVELOPMENT OF IMAGE WORSHIP IN THE JEWISH CHURCH—	
Proclivity to Image-Worship derived by the Jews in Egypt,	377
Reformation of the Jews from Idolatry after the Baby- lonian Captivity,	377
Image Worship in the Christian Church a Stumbling- block to the Conversion of the Jews and a princi- pal if not the sole Cause of the Origin of Moham- medanism,	377
DEVELOPMENT OF IMAGE - IDOLATRY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH—	
Apolegetic Reasons advanced by Romanists for the fact that the Christian Church of the first Four Cen- turies prohibited Image Worship,	378
Charges of Celsus against the Early Christians for not using Images,	378
Neander's Church History referred to on the Origin of Image Worship,	378
The Use of Pictures as <i>Historical Instructors</i> intro- duced or patronised in the Church by Gregory I., Gregory II. the great Papal Inaugurator of Image Wor- ship,	379
The Greek Church in Opposition to the Roman on the subject,	379
Various and Conflictive Conciliar Legislation on the subject,	379
Image Worship finally Established in the Papacy by the Second Council of Nice,	379

MODERN DEVELOPMENTS OF IMAGE WORSHIP— . . .	380
Romanism Retrograding instead of Advancing with the Light of the Nineteenth Century, . . .	380
Ascription of Healing Power to her Images, . . .	380
WORSHIP OF THE ROMAN PUPPET CALLED THE BAMBINO— .	380
Description of the Bambino from the <i>Weekly Register</i> , .	381
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS OF IMAGE WORSHIP—	381
Illustration by a Reference to the Bambino Worship of Rome,	381
The Tendencies of this Idolatry on the Wellbeing of Society should evoke the Special Interference of the Civil Power,	381
This Position Illustrated by the Historical Collisions between the Papacy and Civil Powers on the subject,	382
NINTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED—	
Article quoted,	383
The Article Defective and Misleading in Relation to the True Doctrine of the Church,	384
Leo X. quoted on Indulgences,	384
Two Forms for the Application of Indulgences, distin- guished by Leo, viz., by <i>Absolution</i> and by <i>Suffrage</i> ,	384
The Pope the sole Fountain of Authority in Relation to Indulgences,	384
Theological Object of an Indulgence defined, . . .	384
Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed quoted on the subject,	385
Challoner's Misapplication of Scripture exposed, .	385
The Legal Basis of an Indulgence explained, . . .	385
Division of Indulgences into <i>Plenary</i> and <i>Partial</i> , .	386
Bishop Hornihold's "Real Principle of Catholics" quoted,	387
Bishop Bouvier quoted on the Principle of an In- dulgence,	387
The "Treasury" out of which the Pope grants In- dulgences,	388
Effects of a Plenary Indulgence as defined by Bouvier,	389
The Two Forms of Indulgences distinguished by Leo X. referred to and explained,	389

	PAGE
Bouvier quoted on the Method of Applying for an Indulgence to the Pope,	390
Bouvier's Defence of the Cash Payments necessary to Procure an Indulgence,	390
" <i>Model of a Petition to the Pope to obtain an Indulgence,</i> "	390
WHAT IS AN INDULGENCE?—	391
"Indulgences granted by the Sovereign Pontiff,"—a Book published by the Catholic Book Society,—quoted on several points connected with Indulgences,	391
Indulgences Explained according to this Work,	391
Answer to the Question, What is an Indulgence? supplied from this Work,	392
Another Answer to the same Question,	393
"The Treasury of the Church" stated to be "the Ground and Matter of an Indulgence,"	393
The Treasury consists of the <i>Superfluous Merits</i> of the Saints added to those of Christ,	393
This Treasury equivalent to the Account called "Stock" in the Italian System of Bookkeeping,	393
Fourfold Element of the Stock,	394
The Four Component Elements of the "Stock Account" explained,	394
Another Answer to the Question, "What is an Indulgence?" supplied,	394
"Indulgences granted by the Sovereign Pontiff" again quoted on the Distinction between <i>Plenary</i> and <i>Partial</i> Indulgences,	394
Matt. xviii. 23 quoted to the point,	395
Fourth Answer to the Question, "What is an Indulgence?" supplied,	395
Various Kinds of Indulgences enumerated,	395
Indulgences applied to the Dead,	396
Mutual Collision between the Benefits of a Mass and those of an Indulgence,	396
Another Answer given to the Question, "What is an Indulgence?"	397
"Indulgence granted by Sovereign Pontiffs" again quoted,	397
Characterises it as a <i>Fatal Delusion</i> to Feel Certain that we have gained an Indulgence,	397

Another Answer given to the Question, "What is an Indulgence?"	398
Notice of an Indulgence granted by the Pope to the King and Queen of France,	399
Another Answer given to the Question, "What is an Indulgence?"	399
Cardinal Cullen's "Forty Hours' Adoration" referred to on Indulgences,	399
The Cardinal's Account of Indulgences granted to Promote the "Holy Wars" called the Crusades,	399
Indulgences granted by Mohammed,	399
The Cardinal's Account of the Indulgences granted to raise Funds for the Building of St Peter's Chapel at Rome,	400
Tetzel, the famous Indulgence Merchant, appointed to Dispose of the Pope's Wares,	400
Tetzel's Proclamation of Indulgences quoted,	400
Dupin's History of the Church quoted on the Remonstrances of the German Catholics against the New Imposts of Tetzel,	401
Another Answer given to the Question, "What is an Indulgence?"	401
Admonitional Appeal to Roman Catholic Laymen on this Priestly Imposture,	401
Overwhelming Argumentative Overthrow of the Doctrine of Indulgence,	402

DEVELOPMENT OF INDULGENCES—

The Distinction between Indulgence "by way of Absolution" and "by way of Suffrage," otherwise between Indulgence applied to the Living and to the Dead—otherwise between <i>Penitential</i> and <i>Purgatorial</i> Indulgences, again referred to,	402
These two Forms of Indulgences Developed consecutively, or at different periods,	403

DEVELOPMENT OF PENITENTIAL INDULGENCES—

Penitential Indulgence Developed in a <i>pari passu</i> fashion with the Sacrament of Penance, and in three stages—the <i>Ecclesiastical</i> (or congregational), <i>Episcopal</i> , and <i>Papal</i> Eras of the Doctrine,	403
Development of <i>Ecclesiastical</i> or <i>Congregational</i> Indulgences,	403

	PAGE
Cardinal Wiseman's Concession that Indulgences or Remissions of Church Censures were originally given by the <i>whole Congregation</i> ,	403
Development of <i>Episcopal</i> Indulgences,	404
The Bishops having usurped the Power of the Congregation, employed this Power for the acquisition of Personal Wealth,	404
Chambers's Encyclopedia quoted on the point,	404
Development of <i>Papal</i> Indulgences,	405
The Pope, jealous of the Advantages to which the Bishops turned the Power of Indulgences, interposed to Restrict this Power to the Authority of the "Holy See,"	405
 DEVELOPMENT OF PURGATORIAL INDULGENCES—	
Mosheim quoted on the subject,	405
Theological Opposition to the Pope's Measures, especially on account of extending Indulgences to the <i>Sphere of the Dead</i> ,	405
 DEVELOPMENT OF THE EXTRAORDINARY FICTION CALLED THE BANK OR TREASURY OF THE CHURCH—	
Mosheim quoted to the point,	405
Exposure of Scripture Perversions in support of the Dogma,	406
Abuse of Indulgences greatly Aggravated after the Pope usurped the Exclusive Power to grant them,	406
Indulgences applied to stimulate the Promotion of the Crusades,	407
Quotation on the point,	407
The Papal Indulgences, the <i>real cause of the disgraceful defeats</i> of the Crusaders,	407
Mosheim quoted on the subject,	407
Indulgences employed by Pope Innocent III. in his Crusades against the Waldenses,	408
 DEVELOPMENT OF JUBILEES OR JUBILISTIC INDULGENCES—	
Jubilistic Indulgences created by Boniface VIII.,	408
Bishop Bouvier quoted to this effect,	408
The Bull for the first Jubilee in 1300, and its success as described by Bouvier,	409

	PAGE
Charges made by succeeding Popes in the periodicity of Jubilee seasons,	409
Bouvier quoted on the point,	409
Fall in the Popular Value of Indulgences towards the close of the Fifteenth Century,	410

CONNECTION OF INDULGENCES WITH THE REFORMATION—

Enterprise of Leo X. for the Re-construction of the St Peter's Chapel at Rome,	410
Sale of Indulgences to Promote the Enterprise,	410
The Abuses involved in this Traffic, the immediate Cause of the Reformation,	410

CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES—

Functions of this Congregation explained,	411
Quotation from Dr de Sanctis's work, on the Congrega- tion of Indulgences,	411

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL RELATIONS OF INDULGENCES—

Difference between Romanism studied in its Books of Theology and the page of History,	412
Indulgences in connexion with Irish Fenianism,	413

PLENARY INDULGENCE OF IRISH FENIANISM— 413

Pope Gregory XIV. grants Indulgences to the Irish Fenians of his day,	413
Quotation illustrating the case,	413
Bulls of Indulgence granted to Irish Fenians by Clement VIII.,	413
Quotation illustrating the case,	413
Bulls of Indulgence granted to Irish Fenians by Urban VIII.,	414
These Indulgences in relation to present-day Fenian- ism,	415
Depression in the Monetary value of present-day Indul- gences,	415
Hopeful Prayer that the Pope may yet be induced to indulge his Flock with the Gospel,	416

CORRIGENDA.

On page 28, line 15 from the top, for "alterative," read
"alternative."

On page 36, line 13 from the top, for "practice," read
"practices;" and on line 17, for "controversy," read
"controversies."

On page 37, line 7 from the top, for "*sanctum*," read
"*sanctam*."

On page 39, line 21 from the top, for "Rome," read
"Rom."

On page 122, line 38 from the top, for "delineations,"
read "delineation."

On page 156, line 23 from the top, the sectional heading,
"Penance," requires to be read in *Clarendon* type,
like all the similar headings in the work.

PREFACE.

Organisation for the Study of the Controversy.

A CAREFUL examination of the principles which have regulated the growth and moulded the system of the Papacy must afford the best foundation for an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the controversy. Accordingly, this work embraces a system of Class instruction and other auxiliary operations, based upon the process by which Popery is known to have originated, expanded, and acquired its present form of doctrine and polity—a process now theologically and controversially known as

The Development Theory of Popery.

Romanism, according to the line of defence adopted by its modern advocacy, is no longer pictured to us as an originally complete system, issuing from the head of the Church, like Minerva from the brow of Jupiter, in a perfect doctrinal panoply, and armed with all the weapons of its present faith, to war against the world, the flesh, and the devil. This was the old traditional lie which has deceived so many generations of the past, but which the growth of information has of late years so fully exposed, that now every sufficiently enlightened Romanist is constrained to abandon it for the modern theory of development.

By this theory the Romanist makes the novel admission that his unchangeable Church has been always changing, and that her creed and polity have been a progressively formed and gradually developed system. The advocates

of the Papacy have found that Scripture and Tradition were no longer sufficient to meet the controversial wants of the Church, and that her new dogmas required a new Rule of Faith. The acquirement of such a rule could present no obstacle to the Church, for it was plain, that if the Church has authority to create new articles of faith, she must have equal power to create a new Rule of Faith. Accordingly, a new rule has been originated and adopted with such general acceptance, that this rule—the rule of “Development,” or Scripture and Development instead of Scripture and Tradition—may now be regarded as the settled canonical system of the Church.

Such a revolution in the Church’s standard of faith has created a necessity for some corresponding changes in the management of the Romish controversy; and accordingly the present Prospectus has subjected the matter of its pages to a form of treatment which tallies with the new canonical system of the Papacy. In other words, the rule of Scripture and Development, as explained by Mohler, Newman, and other polemic leaders now in the Church, and as ratified by tokens of approbation supplied by the Pope himself, is here adopted as the basis of an arrangement for the study and discussion of the Romish controversy.

Mohler and Newman on Development.

The necessity for the additional Rule of Faith called Development, was felt as early as the Council of Florence, 1428. From that date to the present, Development (which, of course, like every other novelty, required to be developed itself) has been gradually assuming tangibility of shape in the hands of several individual doctors of the Church, the most prominent in recent times being Dr Mohler of Bavaria, and Dr Newman of our own island and our own day.

Mohler unfolded his theory principally in reference to the development of the popedom, upon which subject he says, among much of a similar character:—

“It is evident that, during the first three centuries, and even at the close of them, *the primacy is not yet visible*, save in its first lineaments; it operates as yet informally.”—*Mohler’s Symbolism.*

Again, to the same effect, Dr Newman, the importer and expositor of Mohler's theory, says :—

"In the first ages of the Church this doctrine (the primacy of the see and bishop of Rome) *existed only in a seminal form*—it was a mystery."

"First, the power of the *Bishop* awoke, then the power of the *Pope*."—*Essay on Development*, p. 165.

"Christianity developed in the form, first of a *Catholic*, and then of a *Papal Church*."—*Ibid.*, p. 319.

The theory of Development, therefore, however damaging to the Papacy in other respects, has the advantage of being in harmony with the facts of history,—a circumstance which makes the cultivation of historical testimony a special necessity in our present-day controversy with the Church of Rome.

Since the publication of Newman's treatise, the principle of Development has not only been homologated by the heads of the Church, but by the popular Roman Catholic literature of the day ; and from the latter source it is also fast receiving additional and lucid expositions,—as the example subjoined, from one of the ablest Romish writers of the present time, will serve to illustrate.

Development, as expounded by the Romish Organ, called the "Home and Foreign Review."

The Home and Foreign Review is but a continuation, under a new cognomen, of the late able Roman Catholic periodical called the *Rambler*. The editor is Sir John Acton, and we are safe in ascribing to his pen the subjoined passage from an article in the *Review*, entitled "Conflicts with Rome." The aim of the article is to shew that, when "the Holy See" develops or introduces new elements into the dogmatic system of the Church, and these in harmony with the common sentiments of the Roman Catholic body, opposition to the Church is not only an evil, but a futile assault upon the prerogatives of the Holy See. In his reference to the rule by which the Church develops, or should develop, the very philosophy of the process is clearly exhibited ; and he illustrates with marvellous verity the

modus by which new dogmas come to be developed in the Papacy.

"What is the Holy See in relation to the masses of Catholics, and where does its strength lie? It is the organ, the mouth, the head of the Church. Its strength consists in *its agreement with the general conviction of the faithful*. When it expresses the common knowledge and sense of the age, or of a large majority of Catholics, its position is impregnable. The force it derives from this general support makes direct opposition hopeless and disedifying, tending only to division, and promoting reaction rather than reform.

"The influence by which it is to be moved* must *pervade the members in order that it may reach the head*. While the general sentiment of Catholics is unaltered, the *course of the Holy See remains unaltered too*. As soon as that sentiment is modified, Rome sympathises with *the change*. The Ecclesiastical government, based upon the public opinion of the Church, and acting through it, cannot separate itself from the mass of the faithful, and *keep pace with the progress* of the instructed minority. It follows slowly and warily, and sometimes *begins by resisting and denouncing what in the end it thoroughly adopts*. Hence a direct controversy with Rome holds out the prospect of great evils, and at best a barren and unprofitable victory. The victory that is fruitful springs from *that gradual change in the knowledge, the ideas, and the conviction of the Catholic body, which in due time overcomes the natural reluctance to forsake a beaten path, and by insensible degrees constrains the mouth-piece of tradition to conform itself to the new atmosphere with which it is surrounded*. The slow, silent, indirect action of public opinion bears the Holy See along without any demoralising conflict or dishonourable capitulation. This action it belongs essentially to the graver scientific literature to direct."—*Home and Foreign Review*, No. 8, April 1864, Art. 12—"Conflicts with Rome."

Thus, it appears that the creed of the Papacy is not a system of traditional belief, originating with the Apostles, and descending from them through the head and hierarchy of the Church, for deliverance and dissemination among the popular masses, but constant emergences of new faith, hatched in the common brain of the Church, and ascending out of the state of incubation,—denominated by Newman the state of "mystery,"—through the various gradations of the priesthood, until they reach "the mouth" of the Church,

* A parenthetical sentence which occurs after this word, and tending to obscure rather than explain the writer's meaning, is here omitted. The precise words omitted are the following, "must be directed first on that which gives it strength, and."

and thence receive explosive expression in the Pope's oracular thunders.

According to Sir John Acton, the mouth of the Church often for a time refuses to inhale "the new wind of doctrine," but the pneumatic pressure continues to increase, until by and by "the mouth" is compelled not only to give admission to the new element of faith, but to call the popular breath by which it has been moved to speak, the inspiration and breath of the Holy Ghost !

Fourfold Development of Popery.

As so many have undertaken to expound the doctrine of Development, it falls in with the design of this work to help out such explanations with its own views on the subject.

The Papacy, like the organisations of nature, develops by the double process of *secretion* and *excretion* ; but reversing the natural process of these operations—instead of absorbing the good and expelling the evil—the genius of her eclectic appetite is to appropriate the vile and eject the salutary ! The Church consecrates and canonises the infamous and base, and excommunicates, curses, and crushes out of her constitution whatever tends to elevate and bless man.

In the further study of this theory of Development, which is *the only one that can explain the phenomena of the Papacy*, the inquirer will be easily led to perceive that the system has unfolded itself in certain aspects and relations to the world, which are reducible to at least four very distinct and consecutive forms, named in this Prospectus the Historical, Theological, Political, and Prophetical forms of Development.

Historical Development of Popery.

The Church of Rome puts works before faith, and she develops by the same rule. The *facts* of her history precede her *creed*, and *practice* passes into *principle*. The *Tracts for the Times*, iv. 20, refer to this principle of Development as an imitation of "the ancients." These are the words of the writer :—

"The circumstance that the ancients agree in their *usage*, but differ

as to their *reasons*, shews that *the reasons were built on the usage, and not the usage on the reasons.*"

This process, by which facts are translated into principles of belief, is amply illustrated by Mohler and Newman's examples in reference to the Pope's Supremacy. Every one knows that the Bishop of Rome, by reason of the secular prominence of his See—the city of Rome—was long practically a Pope ere he assumed the office by any theoretically or theologically defined claims. According to Mohler, the Papacy then "operated informally," or without the formality of a definition, professing to establish his office upon scriptural and traditional grounds. The Pope's office then existed in the form which we have called *Historical Development*. It was the exercise of a headship resulting merely from the circumstantial influences of his position. It had no dogmatic existence, and consequently involved no obligation to believe in what is now termed the *doctrine* of Papal Supremacy.

Theological Development of Popery.

As already intimated, the creed of Rome is fashioned out of her practice. An article of faith is but the theological expression, or, as it is termed, the "definition" of some dogma already existing as a practical innovation in the doctrine or polity of the Church. The several steps in this process of theological development or faith-forming, are very clearly illustrated by the case of the "Immaculate Conception," the last fruit of theological development. At first the rising dogma is broached by some enthusiastic individual as a "pious opinion." It next becomes a topic of controversy, called a "scholastic question." The favourers of the embryo tenet having become a majority, the dogma is now declared to be an "Apostolic tradition." It next obtains practical recognition in the Church by some festival, or devotional form, called in the Creed of Pius IV. an "Ecclesiastical tradition," or an "observance of the Church." Lastly, the Pope, having watched the practical development of the dogma till sufficiently ripe to receive the sanction of his *imprimatur*, defines it as an article of faith, necessary for human salvation. Such is Theological Development.

The Papacy, having attained to a sufficient development of its spiritual dominion, soon made its acquired authority to govern the soul the ground of a similar claim to govern the body,—to usurp the province of the magistrate in his legal relations to the subject, and thus to make both the civil ruler and the civil subject the common subjects of ecclesiastical authority.

To propound this scheme of secular development with some degree of plausibility, temporalities were declared to be subservient to spiritual interests,—the Church was therefore superior to the State; and as an inference from the latter conclusion, the Pope assumed to be Lord of the prince. To further soften the harshness of this usurpation, Bellarmine and the Doctors succeeding, devised “a distinction without a difference” between the spiritual and temporal authority. In the one case the Pope governs by a *direct*, in the other by an *indirect* assumption of power;—that is, while his spiritual power is an immediate faculty of his office, requiring no intervening medium as a ground of authority, his temporal power is only exercised through or by reason of his ecclesiastical office,—a notable difference with regard to the benefit which it brings to the subject of the Pope’s temporal tyranny! Thus out of the religious usurpations of the Papacy came to be “developed” that political domination, which never ceased to expand and ripen until the thirteenth century saw the Pope lay claim to a universal temporal, as well as universal spiritual supremacy.

Prophetical Development of Popery.

Prophecy is merely history anticipated,—a picture of future events *developed* in perspective on the canvas of time. In no case is this prophetic development more obvious in its application to the correlative events and facts of time, than in the prophetic history of the Papacy. Every stage and form of its progressive evolutions are so clearly foreshadowed and defined in the pages of inspiration, that none except those deluded by judicial obliquity

of judgment can mistake their application to the historic counterpart.

Popery, so far as the system has been already referred to in these pages, develops in a threefold form, Historical, Theological, and Political. These three forms of expansion are judged to comprehend the whole of the evolutions and characteristics of the system.

The Prophetic Development, therefore, is not intended to signify any *fourth* and distinctive form of evolution in the system, but Romanism as predictively unfolded in the divine page, and in each of those phases of expansion to which reference has been made.

In other words, the Prophetic Development of Popery simply signifies the history of the system as prospectively unfolded to us in its various phases in the sacred page.

Study and Discussion of Popery according to its Fourfold Development.

The four phases of Popish development, which have been distinguished and explained in the preceding pages, are recommended as the basis of a corresponding method for the study and discussion of the Papal system, not only as regards the division of the subject into separate departments of inquiry, but as respects the formation of Classes and other organisations for the cultivation of the controversy. By this, it is not meant that inquiry or discussion in any one of these departments can be so conducted as not to include reference to matters proper to one or other of the rest. Inquiry and discussion will often have to obliterate such lines of distinction, and will necessarily include in one department what more distinctively belongs to some other. Hence this division, as a ground of investigation and discussion, is simply meant to constitute a *general basis of arrangement* for handling the subjects, and organising the instrumentality connected with the Popish Controversy.

Study and Discussion of Historical Romanism.

According to the preceding scheme, investigation, controversial and other exercises, proper to this development of

Popery, will have for their objects the facts and events evolved in the history of the Papacy. It will therefore include—controversial investigations on the rise, growth, and establishment of Popery as a general system; its introduction, progress, and results in particular countries, states, or kingdoms; the origin and history of individual dogmas, institutions, and other particular developments of the system; the history of the prominent schisms, controversies, and wars of the Papacy; the historical career of individuals and agencies specially influential in rearing the structure and developing the principles of the Papacy, including the lives of its more remarkable “saints,” doctors, fathers, and popes. In a word, this department includes whatever concerns the practical development of Popery as revealed in the page of History.

The History of Popery differs little from what is usually denominated Ecclesiastical History. This will be evident, if we consider that very few years elapsed after the introduction of Christianity, when the principles of Popery began to appear in the Church; and the subsequent development of these tares so speedily overtopped the Gospel seed, that *Popery, not Christianity*, forms the subject matter—the almost exclusive theme of Ecclesiastical History. In other words, with the exception of the inspired narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, the history of the Church from the first to the sixteenth century is simply the history of the Papacy, or the history of the corruption of Christianity by the propagation and general establishment of the papal superstition, and the forging of those political fetters with which the Papacy so effectually succeeded in enslaving the great mass of civilised humanity.

Study and Discussion of Theological Romanism.

The exercises of study and discussion pertaining to this department of the controversy, have for their object to investigate and refute the distinctive religious tenets of the Church of Rome, including its ceremonial, devotional, and disciplinary peculiarities. In controversial discussion, more especially, this department requires accurate reference to

the standards of the Church, to the more popular divinity contained in its many manuals of religious instruction, and defended in its numerous polemical treatises, and above all, to that scriptural test by which all doctrines are to be tried.

In this department the new Rule of Faith, or Development, specially exposes the old rule of Tradition, and, next to the Bible, affords beyond comparison the best ground of successful argument to the modern Protestant controversialist.

Study and Discussion of Political Romanism.

Questions proper to this department of the controversy, concern the relations of Popery to politics, or to civil governments and national interests. Sometimes the question may concern the political and social influence of Popery in the aggregate, and sometimes the secular and social effects of one or other of its particular dogmas or practical institutions.

In either case, this head comprehends the study and discussion of Popery in its relation to civil constitutions; to the exercise of legislative, administrative, and executive functions, the prerogatives of the civil magistrate, and the obligations, rights, and privileges of the civil subject.

Study and Discussion of Prophetical Popery.

The questions pertaining to this head of controversial inquiry have for their object the relations of Popery to prophecy; or, to investigate the inspired page touching those predicted developments of Popery which constitute in the prophetic delineations of the system the real "Marks of the Church."

The object of this head of inquiry, then, is to ascertain the applications of Scripture prophecy to the rise, growth, characteristics, and destinies of the Papacy; and, as prophecy, with small exception, can only be safely interpreted by its counterparts in the realities of time, a knowledge of these realities in relation to the Papacy,—in other words, an adequate study of the system *in each of those developments which have been made the subject of reference in the*

preceding pages,—becomes a necessary preparation for the study of Popery in relation to prophecy.

According to the prophetic scheme of development, Satan was allowed just 1260 years for the erection of the vast apostate fabric of which he forms the invisible head. As the prophetic terminus of the system must depend upon the date at which these 1260 years commence, great pains have been taken to wrest this latter secret from the inspired page without a corresponding clearness in results. The obscurity which yet hangs about this question, in all likelihood has arisen from neglecting to keep in view the triplicity of the form and stages in which the Satanic architect laid the foundations of the Papacy—namely, the three forms and stages of development which have received illustration in the previous pages of this little Work. Each of these forms of growth—to wit, the Historical, Theological, and Political—have a separate and definite temporal origin. Hence the Papacy instead of *one*, has had at least *three* commencements; and as a consequence flowing from this fact, we may expect that the overthrow of the system will be effected by three corresponding stages of destruction,—with this difference in the case (indicated by the past and current history of the Papacy) that the processes of development are destined to undergo a reversion in the corresponding stages of destruction.

In the construction of a material edifice, the order of erection proceeds from the basement to the roofing; but in the time-wearing dilapidation of the building, the decay commonly begins at the roof and proceeds downward. So with the edifice of the Papacy. Its foundations were laid in practical corruption,—on this basis was laid a dogmatic superstructure,—and the system was then roofed and sheltered by assuming to itself a secular kingdom and a political code. Just the reverse is the course of action now going on for its overthrow. The destruction of its political sovereignty, supremacy, and acquisitions, are all but accomplished. Next the influence of its dogmatic system is fast disappearing before the progress of the latter-day Atheism; and when this unbelief is sufficiently matured, as a matter

of course, the practical and devotional corruptions, the entire structure of its sensuous worship and ceremonial harness,—for want of its defunct superstitious support,—must perish, and, like “the baseless fabric of a vision, leave not a wreck behind.”

According to the preceding remarks, then, the 1260 years allotted to the development of Popery have three initial periods. The respective dates marking the origin of these three forms of growth in the constitution of the Papacy, and consequently the respective dates of the corresponding disruptions by which the system of Popery is to be overthrown, may be made matter of inquiry in the Hand-Book on the Prophetic Development of the Papacy, designed to follow the present one.

Practical Organisation for the Study and Discussion of Popery on the basis of its Fourfold Development.

As already implied, the fourfold scheme for the study of Popery offers an advantageous basis for a corresponding arrangement in the

1. ORGANISATION OF CLASSES.

These, then, according to the respective forms of Popish development, are—

1. *The Historical Popery Class.*
2. *The Theological Popery Class.*
3. *The Political Popery Class.*
4. *The Prophetical Popery Class.*

In the organisation of these Classes, one of the most important considerations is the employment of such exercises as are most suitable and effective in relation to the end in view—a sound and sufficient knowledge of the controversy. After much experience and deliberation, the course of procedure recommended, not only to promote a competent knowledge of the controversy, but to cultivate general intellectual improvement and speaking talent, is the following:—

2. CLASS EXERCISES.

1. The preparation and delivery of an *Essay, Discourse, or Lecture*, on a specified and previously appointed subject;

the deliverance being either with or without the aid of a MS., as may be most advisable for the occasion.

2. A *Criticism* on the Essay, including observations on the arguments or statements used, the style and other qualities of the composition, manner of delivery, &c. ; the office of critic being likewise discharged by a previously appointed and prepared member of the Class.

3. A *Discussion*, in which the whole subject, or one or more particular points of the Essay, are made topics of debate, by such of the members as may choose to deliver their sentiments on either side of the question or questions at issue.

The preceding course will, it is expected, be found to embrace such exercises in study, composition, and elocution, as are calculated not only for the effective study of the Romish controversy, but to form qualified speakers and expert debaters on general questions.

Details of procedure in classes come under the head of—

3. CLASS REGULATIONS,

which should be recorded in a Minute-book proper to each Class, and embracing the Rules necessary to define the character of the membership, mode of procedure, and all such appointments as are requisite for regulation of discussion and preservation of order.



INTRODUCTION.

Necessity and Duty of the Romish Controversy.

AMONG the various similitudes employed by Scripture to illustrate the character and experience of Christian life, none, perhaps, is more apt and significant than that which compares the life of a Christian to a warfare; and it is easy to perceive that few departments of this warfare are of more importance than that in which the Christian is called upon to buckle on the armour of truth in order to "contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." False belief, or false religious faith, is the grand instrument by which "the god of this world" first obtained, and has ever continued to preserve, his dominion over the human race. Adam, let it ever be remembered by his posterity in error, fell from his peerless throne by false faith. The sermon preached from the ark for one hundred and twenty years was too short to convince the world that God was about to punish its sins; every plank laid, every nail driven, was a new sentence declaring a coming judgment; but the antediluvian believed otherwise, and perished in a deluge of wrath. The innumerable troubles, and final destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, were simply the result of "a departure from the faith once delivered to the saints."

Notwithstanding the introduction and prevalence of Christianity, false faith is still the prevalent faith of the world. The millions of perishing idolaters in China are simply the victims of false faith. The Brahma worshippers of sunny India are lost to the knowledge of God, and holiness, and happiness, through false faith. The Mohammed-

dans believe in a false prophet, while Popery believes in a false Christ. Like the gospel itself, this last—the system of Antichrist—stands midway between the first promulgation of falsehood in the garden of Eden, and the last development of error, which is yet in the future ; and as the first unites all the revealments of truth in one great system of Divine faith, the other attracts to itself, and comprehends every development of human error in a single great scheme of antichristian deception. Hence Popery may, in some sense, be regarded as the exclusive field of legitimate controversy. Towards all other enemies the flag of truce may often be waved for gentle encouragement and conciliating treatment, but the scriptural soldier is ever to bear on his banner,—“ NO PEACE WITH ROME !”

Peace with Rome is war with Heaven. The great conflicts of the Christian world have ever been fought, and must yet be fought, on the battle-field of Papaldom. Other foes than Popery are but unmarshalled bands—scattered rebels that pursue a guerilla warfare beneath the puny banner of some sectarian disturber of Christian unity. But the army of Babylon are the ranks of a mighty conqueror ; one who has heretofore well-nigh vanquished the gospel itself, and who is not only still in the field of conflict, but is at this moment gathering his forces for a grand and final onslaught upon the citadel of religious and civil rights.

The battle before us, as every battle with Rome, must be fought, not merely for the defence of religious opinion, but of political privilege ; and to be prepared to fight, we must enter the field with our quivers filled, not less to contend with the religious than the—

Political Faith of the Papacy.

The relation of Popery to Politics, or the *Political* principles of the Papacy as distinct from its *religious* element, forms the subject of the succeeding pages. In the usual controversial treatises on Romanism, the religious and political elements are treated in mingled connexion, and the secular principles of the Papacy are commonly viewed and reasoned about as the *religion* of the system. By this course

a defective prominence is given to that which forms the leading feature of Popery; its relationship to national interests are obscured, and an insufficient estimate of its civil and social evils is formed and propagated.

Romanism is not merely a compound of superstition and secular policy, but the secular element is the *soul* of the system,—the vital principle which animates and propels its complex machinery, and alone makes Popery a power in the world. Popery, as a religion, is a form without life, an illusion and a sham; while Popery, as a policy, is a substantial reality, in which the single aim of an energetic and organised priesthood, acting as a nominally religious propaganda, is to subordinate the world to the authority of themselves and the Pope.

Distinctive Treatment of Religious and Political Popery.

Hence the material distinction thus existing between the religious and civil departments of the Papacy requires at least some degree of corresponding demarcation in the controversial treatment of the subject, and some considerations to be kept in view by those who would thus engage in the study and discussion of religious and political Popery as separate systems.

Popery, as a religion, is the slavery of the soul—Popery, as a policy, is the bondage of the body; the one vitiates the individual, the other corrupts the community; the one is the incarnation of a creed which enjoins everything that Christ forbids, and condemns everything that Christ commands—the other is an organised conspiracy against the lawful authority of man, a combination of agencies destructive of human government and civil order.

Popery, as a religion, addresses itself to the sympathies, and invites the holy opposition of the *Christian*; Popery, as a system of policy, being a hostile combination against the temporal interests of all without the pale of the priesthood, should enlist the efforts and invoke the resistance of every man, carnal or Christian. A common foe needs a common defence.

Popery, as a religion, can only be successfully encountered on the battle-ground of the Bible ; Popery, as a temporal policy, may be effectually combated on the field of history, and by weapons of argument drawn from the civil statute-book, the statistic record, social science, and all those sources of information and argument which explain the “*what is and what ought to be*” in the conditions of human life, as under the control of human agency.

Popery, as a religion, is only lawfully resisted by the moral instrumentality of reason and persuasion ; Popery, as a policy, is rightfully opposed by those material means which God has committed to the civil magistrate for “the punishment of evil doers, and the praise of them that do well.”

Hence the relations between Popery and the civil power, and more especially the civil power of Protestant kingdoms, being a needful topic of inquiry to all who would know and resist the baneful encroachments of the Papacy upon the domain of civil rights ; such attempts as the present cannot but meet with a welcome reception from those who are duly interested in this branch of political inquiry.

Political Relations and National Influences of Religion.

All religion necessarily infolds political relations and temporal interests ; and, as a matter of course, its national and social effects will be beneficial or baneful in proportion as the principles propagated are in accordance with that Revelation which is the rule of national as well as of individual ethics,—of public as well as of private conduct.

Accordingly, the due dissemination of revealed religion, in its principles, precepts, and ordinances, cannot but tend to promote the ends of civil government, to facilitate the operation of the laws, and to enforce the duty and obligations alike of the civil magistrate and the civil subject.

On the other hand, it needs only experience to prove that a creed or a code of belief which inculcates false, fanatical, or intolerant principles, however these may be

disguised beneath a religious denomination or a system of *nominally* divine ordinances, must ever obstruct the course of civil legislation, vitiate the obedience of the subject, lead to seditious and sanguinary results, and produce those other bitter and destructive fruits so largely exemplified in the history of nations, and in the

Comparative Influence of Popery and Protestantism on Political Institutions.

In no respect are the comparative fruits of Popery and Protestantism more conspicuous than in their respective influences upon civil institutions and social relations. The different results in this respect have lately originated a large-sized volume from the able pen of Napoleon Roussel. Those who would inform themselves on the national effects of the two systems have only to consult his "Catholic and Protestant Nations compared in their threefold relation to Wealth, Knowledge, and Morality," in order to be fully satisfied that the one is a national curse, the other a national blessing.

Papal Abuse of Religion to Secular Ends.

"Then shall they seek to avail themselves of *names, Places, and titles*, and with these to join
Secular power, though feigning still to act
By spiritual. To themselves appropriating
 The Spirit of God, promised alike and given
 To all believers; and from that pretence
Spiritual laws by carnal power shall
 Force on every conscience."—*Paradise Lost*.

The temporal ambition ascribed to the Papacy in these graphic and truthful lines is entirely the result of that secular spirit which constitutes the true vitality of Popery, and leads it to convert the ordinances of religion into a system of means for the attainment of temporal wealth and political power. Acting nominally as a religious official, and denominating as a religious means whatever answers a temporal end, the priest plants the ladder of ordinances against the wall of the State, and ascends, step by step, until he reaches the *dominium altum* in every

kingdom. Such, at least, was once not merely the principle but the successful practice of the Papacy.

But the Papal abuse of religion did not stop with the mere application of religious ordinances to the prosecution of secular power and profit. To fully adapt the means to the end, a vast and extraordinary change was made in *the government of the Church*; so that, instead of the few and simple regulations of the apostles, Popery transmuted the governing agency of the Church into a mighty monarchy, officered by the Pope, prelates, and priests,—the “King, Lords, and Commons,” in the

Political Constitution of the Papacy.

Romanism is more properly a government than a worship,—a vast and complicated secular organisation, including under the style and externals of a devotional system all the elements of a civil polity—a political crowned head, a statute-book of political institutes called Canon Law, a magistracy of various ranks, decked in canonicals but drilled in diplomacy, and an invisible police bearing the title of Jesuits, or the followers of Jesus, but in reality the followers of a set of maxims so well calculated to bring both subjects and civil rulers under the sway of the Pope, that at one period or another almost every state in Europe has been obliged to banish from its territories this army of conspirators against the independence of sovereigns and the civil and religious liberty of subjects. With such facts before us, we learn the

Fallacy of treating Popery as a Religion or System of Worship.

Since the days of the Reformation, British Protestantism has been largely delivered from the political usurpations of the Papacy. Our practical exemption from the evil has had the usual effect of inducing oblivion in relation to the cause. Every day increased this oblivious influence, until Protestant professors came to regard and treat Popery merely as a form of corrupt religion—a perversion of the gospel destructive to the souls of men. This mistake is

precisely what the priests of the system have ever desired and encouraged. So long as we continue to occupy ourselves with *this aspect* of Popery, the priesthood of Rome will scarcely care if Protestants prove from Scripture even that the Pope is Antichrist, or transubstantiation "a blasphemous fable."

Rome has another goal in view—the *full recovery of that political and social status which she lost among us by the exercise of her intolerant and treasonable principles*. So long as she pursues this object, and succeeds so well in the pursuit, the priests are evidently determined to remain deaf and dumb to our severest exposure of their merely spiritual or religious errors. Silence is a policy which Rome always observes, so long as she feels herself in the light side of the balance. When she comes to find a majority in her behalf, Rome also finds the use of her tongue, and the subdued breath of the tiger passes into the roar of the lion.

Decline of Romanism in Romish States.

Popish, or rather sacerdotal, ascendancy in Church and State is now undergoing a rapid declension *in its own homesteads*. In every Roman Catholic country the star of the Vatican is setting in clouds of gloom and despondency. Every day brings some new tidings of some new aggression upon the time-honoured temporalities of the Church in Popish latitudes. In luminous fulfilment of prophecy, "the horns" (the civil powers) have turned to "hate the whore" and to "eat her flesh"—the prophetic metaphor which denotes the retaliative assaults of the civil powers, and the act of wresting from Rome her secular plunder. The spoil of a thousand years, the domains of priestcraft, the mansions of monkery, as well as her political dominancy, are fast disappearing before the retributive vial which is now being poured out on "the seat of the beast."

Progress of Romanism in Protestant Lands.

Our prophetic allusion restricts the passing vial to "the seat—the homesteads—of the beast." The predictive word,

by limiting this judgment to Popish territories, negatively implies the undisturbed existence and progress of the system *elsewhere*; and where but in those Protestant soils in which the tree of the Papacy is now being sheltered and cherished with political privileges and state endowments? That such mistaken encouragement is rapidly forcing on the progress of Popery in this and other Protestant climes, is simply a matter of present day history and statistical record. The same star which sets apace in Papal horizons, is rising in the social and political sky of every Protestant state,—and especially in Britain and British dependencies,—with a rapidity and splendour which ultimately threatens to eclipse, if not to extinguish, the rival lights that have so long and happily illumined every Protestant clime. The same day which brings some fresh woe to Romanism abroad, brings some fresh weal to Popery here. Throughout Britain the voice of the Popish advocate and the Popish press daily heralds in our ears the multitude of coroneted and clerical converts which the gilded shams of the Church have seduced to her religious communion; and every day brings an increase of her civil capacities, of temporal wealth, institutional extension, and social status in the British commonwealth.

The system, no way checked by the abortive and spasmodic efforts to resist the Papal Aggression of 1850, is gradually unfolding its whole policy and action in this country, and its success in these respects is being rapidly promoted by a temporising, trimming, and human expediency, equally devoid of religious and patriotic principle, in the rulers of the nation.

The Progress of Popery Necessitates a Corresponding Declension of Protestantism.

Where false religion progresses, true religion must ever proportionably decline. Popery, like Christianity itself, *can only grow by the destruction of opposite principles*; so that, where Christianity progresses, there Popery must, in a corresponding degree, decay and perish, and where Popery advances, there true Christianity, in the like ratio, must

wither and decline. If, therefore, we have statistical and other demonstrative evidence of the political and religious progress of Popery at the present day in all Protestant lands, such a fact must be the inevitable index of a *corresponding and commensurate decline of Protestant principle and Protestant power in their own homes*.—See Lecture delivered by the Roman Catholic Archbishop Hughes in New York, 1850. Subject—*The Decline of Protestantism, and its Cause*.

Probable Fearful Issue to Protestantism.

Believing in the present revival of Popery, and the corresponding declension of Protestant principle and power in Protestant homes, and believing also in “the more sure word of prophecy,” an alarming scriptural indication is made to peer out and apply with an almost appalling plainness. Some witnessing powers, according to the soundest interpreters of the predictive word, are yet to be “slain;” that is, their testimony and profession are to be suppressed for a season in the Church, or both in the Church and State. Is the present re-animation of Popery, and the corresponding ex-animation of Protestantism, Ecclesiastical and National—the sole witnessing powers which sustain the truth of Christ in the world—to progress to the fatal issue in which these witnesses are to be slain, or their testimony suppressed?

No attempt is here made to supply an answer to this momentous question; but, to such as would seek to take action against so possible an eventuality in our day and country, the pages of this work are offered, as suggesting both the line of study, and the path of duty necessary to give efficiency and success to their efforts, and to deliver them from the guilt of apathy and indifference to so sacred a cause.

The Work is little more than a digest of heads, exhibiting the different sources from which the political elements of the Papacy have been derived, and the principal forms and results in which they have been developed—an attempt being made to reduce the several heads to a somewhat

systematic arrangement, or to link them together in such a sequential order as to make what precedes introductory to what follows throughout.

It need only be added, that these pages have been penned in accordance with the operative arrangements recommended in the Preface. The general principle of "Development," and the four departments of the unfolding process there noticed, viz.—the *Historical*, *Theological*, *Political*, and *Prophetical*, form the basis of the operative arrangements referred to, and designed to embrace *the whole compass of the controversy*.

To facilitate the acquisition of the controversy in this way, some such compendiums as the present—one for each department—were felt to be needed. The present, being the *Compendium designed to facilitate the Study and Discussion of the Political Relations of Popery*, it is hoped will be found to answer that object with at least some degree of utility and success.

H A N D - B O O K

FOR THE

STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF POLITICAL POPERY.

Civil and Ecclesiastical Government.

ALL society is organised under a classification consisting of two very distinct orders of membership—the *governors* and the *governed*.

The two orders of membership, united and brought into mutual relationship by the appointments and obligations of law, constitute *the State*, although this term is sometimes applied to denote exclusively *the ruling body*.

In the development of States, the centralising principle, which appears to be the great constructive law in the process of all organisation, has been generally found to result in the production of those mural communities which we now call cities. The Greek word for city is *polis*, and as the chief city or polis of a State commonly became the seat of government, the governing body itself came to be called (from polis) a *polity*; its action or course of procedure, *policy*; and the adjective properties of both, *politic* and *political*.

The term polity subsequently came to be applied to any governmental system, while the words *policy* and *politic* have come to signify less the ordinary action of government, than a course of action embracing the prudential skill and management necessary to political success.

In every State, ecclesiastical, military, and other organised systems exist in subordination to the national or political government. When the political government is referred to, as distinguished from any of these subordinate polities, it is usually designated the *civil power*.

From the fact that every State is principally occupied with two great distinctive interests—that which concerns the temporal, and that which relates to the spiritual well-being of the subject—the “civil power” has come very generally to be put in exclusive opposition to Ecclesiastical polity, or to denote the government of *the State* in contradistinction to the body-politic of *the Church*.

Political Relations of the State and Church.

Experience has long shewn that these two powers, the civil and ecclesiastical, oftener conflict than agree in the exercise of their respective functions, and as there is no third party to which their differences can be referred, there remains but one of two ways by which such collisions can possibly be avoided or rectified after they occur. Either one of these powers must be subject to the dominion of the other, or else the boundary line of their respective jurisdictions must be so defined and understood as to allow no room by which either may find a pretext to trespass upon the operative province of the other. But the latter alternative must practically resolve itself into the former; for, a boundary line can only be defined by a definer, and as, in case of a difference on the subject or sphere of jurisdiction,—a difference easily made to include all other differences,—one or other, the Church or the State, must possess this defining prerogative, it follows that one of these powers must be endowed with a jurisdictional supremacy over the other.

Theory of Mutual Independence or Co-ordinate Jurisdiction in Church and State.

Notwithstanding the plainness of the conclusion just arrived at with respect to the necessary supremacy, either of the State over the Church, or the Church over the State,

a third theory, the theory of mutual independence, or, as it is called, of "Co-ordinate Jurisdiction," has been propounded and maintained by a zealous advocacy. According to this view, the State and the Church are equally independent in their respective spheres; the one operating with an uncontrolled and irresponsible freedom in temporal, the other with a like liberty in spiritual interests, and all undue exercise of power on the part of either being restrained by a happy reciprocity of influence illustrated in the following analogy.*

"As in nature all order depends upon the equipoise of two forces, so in society all liberty depends upon the equipoise of two powers,—the strict maintenance of the co-ordinate jurisdiction of Church and State."

In the natural system, the source of the mechanical equilibrium, or balance of powers referred to, is *equality of forces*. We search in vain for such an equipoising principle in the mutual relation of Church and State. If the analogy is appropriate, the desired equipoise between these bodies is to be secured by the possession of a co-equality of material or moral force; meaning by the former the power of material arms, and by the latter the force of argument or persuasion. But no one will say that the jurisdictional powers of Church and State are to be mutually balanced by possessing an equality of military potency; for the Church is scripturally debarred from using such force at all. And again, the powers of the Church and State are as certainly not to be "equipoised" by a co-equality of moral force; for where discords are supported by an equality of reasons, it is evident that the differences, instead of being removed, must *be preserved and perpetuated*! The analogy, therefore, not only fails, but cuts precisely the reverse of the way intended.

The mutual independence and co-ordination of Church and State is equally unsound in theory and impossible in practice. It is unsound in theory, because the principle of government allows of no legal position but sovereignty

* From Dr Wylie's "*Rome and Civil Liberty*," p. 9. London and Edinburgh. 1864.

or subjection. It admits of no felicitous *via media* between these conditions, and is just as exclusive of a rival independence, as a rival sovereignty within the boundary of the State.

Nor is there any practical validity in the position or objection, that the Church claims independent jurisdiction in a sphere of administration differing from that of the State, or that the Church and State may be mutually independent because they govern in the separate provinces of the Temporal and Spiritual; since it is notorious that the conflicts between the Church and the civil power seldom, if ever, concerned the right of the one to rule in temporal and the other in spiritual interests, but about the prior questions—*What was temporal and what was spiritual in the case?*

There is, therefore, no alternative between supreme authority (even in the sphere of religion) exercised by the State, and the same authority (even in the department of politics) exercised by the Church. Religious supremacy must be included in the power of the State, or political supremacy in the power of the Church; and if analogies and parallels are required, many of the most significant character are to be found in favour of the first of these positions.

If we want the highest and most comprehensive analogy, by which to establish this position, we have only to refer to the character of the Divine Government itself. No one will be disposed to deny that the institution of civil sovereignty is a reflection and shadow of the supreme authority—the great theocratic throne—which subjects the universe to the dominion of a *single legislative fountain*.

Hence, *mutatis mutandis*, or changing with the change, in relation to the analogy lately quoted, we may argue that—

As in nature (or the system of the universe) all order depends upon a single fountain of dominion, so in society all liberty (which can only consist with the preservation of order) depends upon a single legislative power—the strict maintenance of the supreme jurisdiction of the State.

Again, the civil and ecclesiastical principles are obviously and respectively indicated in the kingly and priestly

offices of Christ ; and it is equally obvious that while He is “ a priest upon His throne,” His priestly office is subservient to His kingly functions ; so subservient, that in the development of the wonderful plan of redemption, the priest was obliged to suffer the penalty of death in subjection to the royal authority, which had been violated by the rebellion of *the Church* terrestrial against *the State* celestial !

Christ certainly *transmits* these offices to none, much less to the Pope who assumes them, for even now “ the government is upon His shoulders,” and He remains “ a priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedec,” an order “ which passeth not from one to another,” (Heb. vii. 24, marginal translation.) Nevertheless, under the Old Testament, and (although with less proximity and precision of application) under the New, He certainly exercises the respective functions of these offices through a human agency. In this way, Moses was the representative of His kingly, Aaron of His priestly, office: the former, the ruler of the Jewish State ; the latter, the ruler of the Jewish Church : and the one in his office of civil ruler being endowed with a supremacy so distinct and sovereign over the religious chief, that Moses was appointed to be in the place of God unto Aaron, (Exod. iv. 16.)

In the further history of the Jewish Commonwealth and Church, the same subjection of the sacerdotal to the civil power was continued throughout the existence of the Jewish State, so long as it retained the least remnant of that constitution with which the Divine Organiser endowed it.

If the Old Testament is the shadow of the New, the relations of the State to the Church in the one cannot be wholly wanting in the other. Accordingly, not only are we taught the doctrine of civil supremacy by the analogy of the Old Testament, but in the New, many distinct and independent precepts enunciate the subjection of the Church to the authority of the civil magistracy, and more especially “ to the king as *supreme*,” (1 Pet. ii. 13.)

If further illustrations were here necessary, we have one

of the most pertinent and perfect analogies to support the position of this Work in the social relations of the husband and wife. While both of these have a right to rule in their respective spheres, and each with a view to the same interest, yet where a difference of judgment occurs, the wife is "to be under obedience," (1 Cor. xiv. 34.) Nature, as well as revelation, has established this rule, the one by endowing the man with a supremacy of personal *strength* the other with a supremacy of personal *authority*.

Of course, these remarks may be met by the usual regiment of objections, of which the following stand in the first rank. Christ is the exclusive "Head of the Church," and "His kingdom is not of this world." That Christ is the exclusive Head of doctrine and discipline—of law and government—in the universal Church, is freely admitted by all but the Romanist. The question at issue, however, is not, who is the head of the Church, *but by whose instrumentality does Christ exercise His headship?* By the civil ruler exclusive of the ecclesiastic? By the ecclesiastic exclusive of the civil ruler? Or by both in their respective spheres, with a distinct supremacy in the office of the magistrate? The affirmative of this last question supplies the position assumed in these pages.

Again, that Christ's kingdom is not of this world, is a proposition that no way affects this position; for what makes a kingdom, or any institution, an institution of this world? Is it not simply the use of temporal means for *temporal ends*? The ministry, as well as the magistracy, employ temporal means for temporal ends. If the former, as well as the latter, use temporal means for temporal ends, he is ministering in a kingdom of this world; and if the latter, as well as the former, employ temporal means for spiritual ends, he is ministering in "a kingdom which is *not* of this world." There are, of course, temporal means which cannot be lawfully employed even to advance spiritual ends, and the Saviour specifies some of these when He says, "If my kingdom were of this world, *then would my servants fight*," (John xviii. 36,)—a passage which teaches, and teaches without affecting the question before us, that

the interests of religion are not to be promoted or defended by the use of the military weapon.

But again, we are met with a host of ethical puzzles. When the State decides contrary to the conscience of the Church, or some individual of her membership, must the Church or its member obey the State before conscience and the God of conscience?—*Ans.* The State may err, and its decisions may be oppressive and evil. But the same may occur in purely temporal functions, and yet this liability to err does not exclude the subject's obligation to obey. The Scripture rule in both cases is equally plain, "Resist not evil." He who cannot conscientiously obey the precept of the law, can conscientiously suffer its penalty, if the Scripture is the rule of the conscience. When the Church finds occasion to put forth this conscientious objection, she seems to hold it as an article of faith that the State can have *no conscience in the case*. But why? The State is just as much obliged, and certainly just as likely to be conscientiously affected on one side of a question, as the Church is on the other; and where parties are equally conscientious in opposite claims, there is but one possible rule of arriving at a peaceful conclusion—the weak must yield to the strong. In this case, at all events, and it is the only case in which the rule applies—MIGHT IS RIGHT.

Political Confusion of Co-ordination in Church and State.

"My soul aches

To know, when two authorities are up,

Neither supreme, how soon confusion

May enter 'twixt the gap of both, and take

The one by the other."

The principle of co-ordination in Church and State, or their ruling representatives, is not merely incompatible with the due prerogatives of the State, but where such a principle has in any degree obtained, the rival dominion between these bodies has constantly affected the obedience of the subject, and produced that divided allegiance which so commonly results from the opposing claims of these contending parties. Perhaps no writer has exhi-

bited these evils with greater power and effect than the illustrious Isaac Barrow, from whose celebrated work on the "Supremacy of the Pope," the following extracts on this question have been culled :—

Barrow on the Political Evils of Co-ordination.

"This pretence, [the assumption of a rival dominion on the part of the Popish Church,] upon divers obvious accounts, is apt to create great mischief in the world, to the disturbance of civil societies, and the destruction or debilitation of temporal authority, which is certainly God's ordinance, and necessary to the well-being of mankind; so that, supposing it, we may in vain pray 'for kings and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.'—1 Tim. ii. 1, 2."

"For suppose two powers, *spiritual* and *temporal*, to be co-ordinate and independent each of the other, then must all Christians be put into that perplexed state of repugnant and incompatible obligations concerning which our Lord says, 'No man can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other.'—Matt. vi. 24."

"They will often draw several ways, and clash in their designs, in their laws, in their decisions; one willing and commanding that which the other dislikes and prohibits.

"It will be impossible, by any certain bounds, to distinguish their jurisdiction, so as to prevent contest between them, all temporal matters *being in some respect spiritual* (as being referable to spiritual ends, and in some manner allied to religion,) and all spiritual things becoming temporal as they conduce to the secular peace and prosperity of States. There is nothing which each of these powers will not hook within the verge of its cognisance and jurisdiction; each will claim a right to meddle in all things; one pretending thereby to further the good of the Church, the other to secure the interests of the State. And what end or remedy can there be of the differences hence arising, there being no third power to arbitrate or moderate between them?

"Each will prosecute its cause by its advantages,—the one by instruments of temporal power, the other by spiritual arms of censures and curses. And in what a case must the poor people then be! How distracted in their consciences, how divided in their affections, how discordant in their practices! according as each pretence has influence upon them, by its different arguments or peculiar advantages. How can any man satisfy himself in performing or refusing obedience to either? How many, by the intricacy of the point, and contrary pulling, will be withdrawn from yielding due compliance on the one hand or the other?"

"What animosities and contentions, what discomposures and con-

fusions, must this constitution of things breed in every place; and how can 'a kingdom so divided against itself stand,' or not 'come into desolation.'—Matt. xii. 25."

"It is indeed impossible that a co-ordination of these powers should subsist; for each will be continually encroaching on the other—each, for its own defence and support, will continually be struggling and clambering to get above the other."

"The spiritual power pretends an establishment purely divine, which cannot by any accidents undergo any change, diminution, or translation, to which temporal dominions are subject. Its power being [held] perpetual, irreversible, depending immediately of God, can hardly be checked, can never be conquered."

"By such advantages the spiritual power, if admitted for such as it pretends, will swallow and devour the temporal, which will be an extreme mischief to the world.

"The very pretence immediately crops and curtails the natural rights of princes, by exempting great numbers of persons, the participants and dependents of this hierarchy from subjection to them, by withdrawing causes from their jurisdiction, by commanding in their territories, and drawing people out of them to their judicatories, by having influence on their opinion, by draining them of wealth, &c.

"To this discourse experience abundantly yields its attestation; for how often have the popes thwarted princes in the exercise of their power, challenging their laws and administrations as prejudicial to religion, as contrary to ecclesiastical liberty!"

"How often have they excommunicated them, and interdicted their people from entertaining communion with them! How many commotions, conspiracies, rebellions, and insurrections against princes have they raised in several countries! How have they inveigled people from their allegiance! How many massacres and assassinations have they caused! How have they depressed and vilified the temporal power! Have they not assumed to themselves superiority over all powers? The emperor himself, the chief of Christian princes, they called their vassal, exacting an oath from him whereof you have a form in the canon law, and a declaration from Pope Clement V., that it is an oath of fealty. Have they not challenged propriety in both swords? *Ecce duo gladii!*"

"All these dealings are the natural result of this pretence, and supposing it well grounded, are capable of a plausible justification; for is it not fit, seeing one must yield, that temporal should yield to spiritual? Indeed, granting the papal supremacy in spirituals, I conceive the high-flying zealots of the Roman Church, who subject all temporal powers to them, have great reason on their side; *for co-ordinate power cannot subsist*, and it would be only an eternal seminary of perpetual discords.

"Two such powers, so inconsistent and cross to each other, so apt

to interfere, and consequently to breed everlasting mischiefs to mankind between them, could not be instituted by God."

Authority of the Magistrate in relation to Religion.

Many are willing to admit the supremacy of the State, or Magistrate, in relation to the Church and religion, so far as such a supremacy maybe necessary as a defensive policy, or as a security against the encroachments of the Church upon the domain of civil rights ; but *only so far*. That is, they deny to the magisterial office any authority of a positive character in the province and promotion of religious interests.

The validity of such a denial may be argued first, on the abstract authority of the Magistrate as a legislator. If, in the exercise of this power, the civil Magistrate finds the precepts of Jesus Christ adapted to the temporal well-being of the subject, he has just as much right to adopt those precepts as principles of legislation, to enforce them by the sanction of rewards and penalties, and to endow institutions for their promotion, as he has to adopt, enforce, and endow the legislative principles of a Solon or a Justinian.

As those who make this denial, maintain it in connexion with a belief in Scripture, its validity may be further tested by an appeal to this unerring umpire, in which we read—

1 Tim. iv. 8—"Godliness is profitable unto all things ; having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

Godliness here undoubtedly means religion, or those principles which bind us to the service of God ; and the phrase "profitable unto, or having the promise of the life that now is," obviously means prosperity in temporals. Hence we reason thus :—

The Magistrate has power to rule in temporal interests,
and consequently in whatever includes temporal interests ;

Religion includes temporal interests ;

The magistrate has power to rule in religion.

But again, the legislative province of the Magistrate extends to the Church and religion, not merely as a defensive policy, or further as a positive policy for the promotion of

temporal interests, but for the advancement of the *spiritual welfare* of the subjects committed to his charge. The civil Magistrate is scripturally represented as *officially*, as well as *personally*, subject to the great Lawgiver of heaven. He is obliged to consecrate his official as well as his personal talents to the service of the Great Supreme. The scriptural *dictum*, which proclaims that, "by Him kings reign and princes decree justice," obviously implies that kings reign *by* Him, in order that they may reign *for* Him.

Again, that the Magistrate is officially responsible for the institution and promotion of national religion, is obvious from the doctrine of *national sin*, and the consequent penalties called national judgments. National sins are the violation of the Divine law in relation to the religious obligations of the nation. But the religious obligations of the nation, and consequently the religious transgressions of the nation, according to Scripture teaching on the subject, and the acknowledged principles of representative government, are committed through *the official acts of the Magistrate*. Hence, if the Magistrate's office is made responsible for national obligations in relation to religion, and for national sins incurred by the neglect or transgression of such obligations, it follows that his office must include religious capacities, or the right to govern in the sphere and interests of national religion.

Having thus established the principle of a magisterial function in relation to religion, it remains to be inquired—*How such a function is to be exercised?* or to exhibit, in very brief terms,

The Function of the Magistrate in Relation to Religion.

Official functions in relation to religion embrace two very distinct agencies—the *jurisdictive* and *administrative*—the one ruling and the other serving. It is agreed on all hands that the civil office has no connexion with the administrative functions of religion, that the dispensation of the Word, sacraments, and discipline, is without the sphere of the civil official, whose duty, if any, must therefore be *magisterial* and not *ministerial*. What are the

distinct magisterial functions in relation to religion ; how far, and in what respects, the State may exercise its power in reference to religion, may be difficult to define ; but these questions certainly include the following replies :—

1. The State has a right to mould its own constitution, or to organise its official and legal system in harmony with the revealed will of God.

2. To conduct its policy or legislative action with an acknowledged reference to religious obligation.

3. To constitute religious institutions for the promotion of the gospel by educational and ministerial means.

4. To suppress the propagation of religious principles and practice adverse to the civil prerogatives of the State, and the civil rights and obligations of the subject.

These views, as a matter of course, will be thought to enter upon the field of the Erastian and Voluntary controversy, but according to the opinion of this Work, it is the Erastian and Voluntary questions that have come within the precincts of the Popish, and are necessarily included in any comprehensive and polemic consideration of the

Opposite Policy of Popery and Protestantism in the Relations of Church and State.

We have here, as usual, the parallel contrast which everywhere distinguishes the opposite systems of Popery and Protestantism. It is evident from the preceding considerations that, according as we invest one or other of these powers—the State, or the Church—with a relative supremacy, we take the Protestant or Popish side in this department of the controversy. The Protestant, guided by Scripture as well as by sound political dictates, is compelled to hold the principle of civil supremacy in relation to the Church. The Church of Rome, assuming an authority above Scripture, naturally enough claims a like supremacy over the civil power. In the Protestant view of the mutual relationship between these bodies, the Church *is in the State*, and must for that reason be subject to the civil authority. In the Popish system, the *State is in the Church*,

and is therefore subject to the authority of the Church, or rather to the authority of the Pope, as ruled by the following and various equivalent deliverances of the Papal code called Canon Law.

"One sword must be under the other—the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual."—Boniface VIII. in Bull *Unam Sanctum*.

Nor is this pretentious proposition without plausible argumentative support, and especially from that class of perverted analogies which are so often and so successfully employed to advocate false theories, and of which the following is an example, in reference to the present question, from Gregory Nazianzen :—*

"The law of Christ hath subjected you also that are civil magistrates to my chair, unless it be reasonable that the spirit should submit to the flesh, and heavenly things give place to earthly. For temporal things belong to the body, and spiritual things to the soul. By how much, therefore, the soul is above the body, by so much spiritual things are above the temporal; for a temporal end is and ought to be subordinate to a spiritual, because temporal felicity is not the last end of man, but spiritual and eternal. This, therefore, being the greatest, ought to be ministered unto by the cession (or the yielding of submission on the part) of the temporal." —*Orat. 15, Ad. Subd. Tim. Percul.*

If the State has no political relationship to the Church or to religion, the argument here appears logically valid, solid, and convincing. Nor is it easy to see how any Protestant can rebut this logic, who holds that the civil ruler is excluded from the care and control of religion, or that the State represents exclusively material interests. To one who holds that the State and the Church, although in different spheres and functions, are *each* representatives of spiritual interests, the Gregorian fallacy can offer no such difficulty; for, in this case, the moral subjection of the "flesh" to the "spirit" will furnish no analogy for the subjection of the State to the Church, but for the subjection of the secular interests of *both* to the spiritual interests of *both*.

As in a prior case, this appeal to a spurious analogy

* See Mosheim—Reid's Edit., 1861, century 4, p. 134, note on Gregory Nazianzus—for an account of this "Father."

evokes some counter-appeals to true similitudes. The position that the Church is in the State, and not the State in the Church, and that the Church is *therefore* subject to the State, and not the State to the Church, may be illustrated by a variety of parallels founded upon the logical dictum that the species is in the genus, and not the genus in the species—*e.g.*, the woman is in man, and not the man in woman. And here a further interesting parody is suggested by the generative relationship of our primitive parents. As Eve was miraculously produced from Adam, the Church is providentially produced from the State; and as the generative relationship creates the greatest of all dependent obligations, Eve was not less subject to Adam than the Church is to the State.

Again, as when, in the domestic relationship of man and wife, the wife is duly regardful of the authority of her husband, we have an admirable illustration of the proper subjective relationship of the Church to the State; so when, in less felicitous circumstances, the female partner betrays impatience of her husband's legitimate control—when she aspires first to co-ordinate authority, and next to supreme command in the domestic management—we have in such an exhibition of the strumpet animus a faithful representation of that spiritual independence and subsequent domination which the Roman Harlot so early assumed in relation to the civil power.

This assumed independence and domination of the Papacy in relation to the civil power is perhaps the most distinctive Scriptural mark of the Church of Rome—a mark which stands on the very brow of the prophetic photograph which the Scriptures supply of the Papal usurper.

First, he is described as “exalting himself above all that is called god,” (2 Thess. ii. 4,) or above every rank of the civil ruler, who is styled, in relation to his official function or ruling authority, a god in Scripture, (Exod. xxii. 28.) See the annotation of the Rhemish Testament on the passage, which admits the application of the term to the “magistrate,” or civil ruler.

Second, he is described as the “Wicked” One, (2 Thess.

ii. 8 ;) that is, according to the Greek of the passage, the "Lawless" One, or the one who would seek to exalt himself, not only above the civil *ruler*, but above the civil *law*—his person above the person of the prince, his law above the law of the prince. The whole history of the Papacy is just a history of this double usurpation. Space permits only very short illustrations.

Rules for civil etiquette, or for the conduct of princes in the presence of the Pope, are supplied by certain ceremonial works published at Rome for that purpose. The following is a specimen of the rules furnished by one of these works for the conduct of the emperor :—

"When the emperor comes into the Pope's presence, as soon as he sees the Pope, he must uncover, and, bare-headed, bow till his knee touch the ground, and worship the Pope, and coming nearer must bow again ; and when he comes up to the Pope, he must bow a third time, and devoutly kiss the Pope's foot, (*i.e.*, his toe.) The emperor must further worship the Pope with incurvations or bowings of the body even to the ground ; and then, bare-headed and on his knees, devoutly kiss the Pope's foot, (*i.e.*, his toe.)"—*Sacrarum Ceremon. Sanctæ Rome Ecclesiæ. Rome, 1560.*

Thus, as Diocletian, the Roman emperor, issued a public edict by which all men were bound to worship his foot, the Pope, in his turn, compels the emperor to reciprocate the compliment. So much for the exaltation of the Pope's *person* above the civil official. Next, as to the exaltation of the Pope's *law*, that is, the Canon Law, above the civil law. The authority of the Pope's mandates over civil enactments is not only established by numerous individual constitutions of the Papal statute-book, but all legislative formulas proceeding from the Papacy are worded with a special regard to this jurisdictional supremacy. Even at the present day, every bull and papal missive assumes a total independence of, and supremacy over, all civil legislation. Take, as an example, a conclusive sentence or two from the Bull of the Papal Aggression—a Bull which both anticipates and repels the counteraction of British civil law in these words :—

"Moreover we decree, that if in any other manner any attempt shall be made by *any person or by any authority*, knowingly or

ignorantly, to set aside these enactments, such attempt shall be *null and void.*"

The pretext for this exemption from the control of the civil law is *religious liberty*. The Pope consistently maintains that a free State is incompatible with a free Church, and that fully to liberate the Church from the control of the State, all civil law must retreat before the free legislation of the Church. Let us hope that those Protestant societies which are organised for the "liberation of religion from State control" are not actuated by the same animus, and that the lawless leaven of the Papacy is not unconsciously expanding itself in Protestant dough.

A cardinal argument for such a deliverance of the Church from State control, is based upon the acknowledged historical fact, that the Church, anterior to the epoch of Constantine, or the beginning of the fourth century, was entirely free from all State connexion, and that during the period of this freedom the torch of religion burned with its brightest lustre.

It is not necessary here to dispute the purity of the Church at the beginning of the fourth century, or to show that the "Mystery of Iniquity," which "already worked" even in Paul's day, had largely departed from the gospel of Paul in the days of Constantine.

It is sufficient to refer to the fact that the Church before Constantine was subject to the domination of a *Pagan* magistracy; and that hence any argument based upon the absence of a Church connexion with a Pagan polity affords no foundation for the same disconnexion of the Church and State when the latter is a Christian government.

It is freely conceded that the Church was corrupted by its union with civil Rome. A semi-corrupted Church with a wholly corrupted State produced a union, not of Civil and Ecclesiastical Christianity, but of

Civil and Ecclesiastical Popery.

When the State not only frames its constitution and legislation in accordance with some religious creed, but assumes such a jurisdictional relationship to the Church as

to deny to the latter all power of discipline and self-government, we have what has been called *Erastian** or *Civil religion*.

On the other hand, when the Church excludes the State from all participation in her polity, and puts the whole care and control of religion in the hands of a clerical head or body, we have what may be called *Ecclesiastical* or *Hierarchical religion*. It is only in the well-regulated union of the two orders, the State and the Church, that we have the religion of *the Christian Commonwealth*.

In a similar way, the principles of Popery may be developed in the State, as distinct from the Church, or in the Church as distinct from the State; and then we have in the one case *Civil*, and in the other *Ecclesiastical Popery*.

Civil Popery employs the instrumentality of the State, not to subserve, but to subjugate religion; Ecclesiastical Popery employs the means or instrumentalities of religion, not to subserve, but to subjugate the State; and the growth and expansion of its power in this way constitutes the

Development of Political Popery.

Political Popery, in accordance with preceding explanations, may be defined as the principle of Ecclesiastical Supremacy theoretically developed and practically exercised through the respective departments of the creed and government of the Papacy—a development and practice historically introduced in a series of stages in which we find the Church—

- 1st. A willing *dependent on* the State;
- 2d. Dividing *authority with* the State;
- 3d. Claiming *jurisdiction over* the State;
- 4th. Yielding *subjection to* the State.

The first stage of this development commenced under Constantine—a stage which lasted, in round calculation, from the fourth to the eighth century. During this period Constantine and his successors, either on the Western or the Eastern throne of the empire, guided by the councils of

* See Eadie's *Ecclesiastical Cyclopædia*, *Art.* ERASTIANISM.

an already corrupted and ambitious Episcopate, inaugurated the chief political elements of the Papacy, by incorporating the canons of the Church with the civil law, making heresy a political offence, and otherwise identifying the religious with the political principle.

The second stage of this development commenced with the age and reign of Charlemagne, and lasted from the eighth to the twelfth century. Nearly the whole of this period was spent in conflicts between the Papacy and the civil powers of Europe. But while the Papacy suffered many occasional reverses, it continued to advance in the acquisition of political power. Every successive reverse was but the receding wave of the steadily-progressing tide.

The third stage lasted from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. In this stage the Papacy, supporting its political tactics with the terrific influence of a multiplied and manifold spiritual artillery, upon the whole gained the victory of political dominion over the civil powers of Europe.

The fourth stage commenced with the Reformation in the sixteenth century, and continues to run its course to the present. The Reformation at once arrested both the political and the religious progress of the Papal Church; and without at all causing her to repeal any of her political code, has induced a comparative degree of sobriety in the mode of putting her claims. From this date the reaction of the civil powers became marked and decisive, and year after year the European governments have continued to coerce the Papacy into a surrender of its civil usurpations, and more especially of the enormous secular plunder which it had acquired by so many ages of "pious fraud."

There is one more development of the Papacy to come, and therefore only to be known by prophetic teaching, and consequently not to be dwelt upon here, except in a passing notice. In the prior development of political power, the Church and the State partitioned the rule of the world between them, and this on the most despotic principle of government. A third power, the people, at length succeeded in dividing authority with these two dominions, and has come to exist as an acknowledged political element

in all constitutional governments. Not satisfied, however, with a participation of political power, Democracy evidently desires to become the exclusive source of all ruling authority.

The Roman Harlot is at present bewailing the loss of her State paramours ; but she beholds Young Democracy rising with aspiring mien, and pushing with giant efforts, and promising success for the goal of political dominion. Wrinkled with age, and tottering on the brink of an already excavated grave, the old adulteress is still uncured of her carnal appetite, and is now obviously seeking to catch the protective arm of this new aspirant to political power.

For this purpose the Pope may be shortly expected to change his programme of action to suit the times—to popularise his system, and so to win to himself a “party of action” in the fierce struggle of no distant day when Royalty, Romanism, and Revolution will make the last great effort for the dominion of the world.

Hence, for the future, Romanism may be expected to care little about secular princes, senates, laws, or statesmen. The popular and periodical congresses now being formed at Malines, and elsewhere, indicate the style of secular help which the Papacy is aiming to attract to itself for support in coming emergencies.

Causes effecting the Development of Political Popery.

The facts and forms of the political developments of the Papacy being thus very briefly noticed, it remains to revert to the *causes* which have either produced or permitted its enormous secular acquisitions in power and wealth. Such a consideration of causes is both one of the most interesting and one of the most essential lines of investigation in the study of political Popery, and would be much facilitated by some such analysis as the subjoined :—

- 1st. *Circumstantial causes* effecting or favouring the growth of Political Popery.
- 2d. *Motive causes*, or mental influences operating in producing the political phenomena of the Papacy.
- 3d. *Instrumental causes*, or the means employed by the Papacy to accomplish its secular ends.

The celebrated work of Isaac Barrow appropriates an entire section of its elaborate pages to the consideration of the causes in question, and without resorting to any classification such as the preceding, it arranges these causes under no less than thirty-six heads, amplified and explained by subjoined remarks to each head. The pith of these several heads is embraced in the following digest of

Barrow's Thirty-six Causes accounting for the Political Development of the Papacy.

1. The tendency of *honorary eminence of any kind*, such as that possessed by the Bishops of Rome in the early ages of the Church, to pass into the acquisition of real power.

2. The tendency of *any real power* thus acquired, and, however small, to grow into higher degrees of usurpation.

3. The special expansive nature and usurpational tendency of *spiritual or clerical power*, in consequence of the facilities which this affords for the acquisition of temporal advantages.

4. The *influence of dissension* in causing the opponents concerned to seek the alliance and protection of a prominent chief, and thus to enhance and consolidate his power. In such a way parties persecuted sought the Pope's protection—parties at variance with others sought his counsel or decision in the case ; and thus the Pope early acquired the power of deciding such appeals.

5. The *influence of dependencies*. Persons whose position and interest depend upon those of higher power will be always given to uphold that which upholds them. Hence the zeal of the Pope's vast official army, every rank of which depends upon the next superior one, until the head is reached upon which the whole hangs. Hence,

6. A power supporting dependencies, however passive in relation to ambitious designs or efforts, will grow by the mere force of those agencies which seek to preserve themselves by preserving it.

7. The desire of power, when exercised even by good men, to *uphold undiminished, if not to augment, the acquisitions* of predecessors in the same office.

8. The *natural subserviency and flattery* usually manifested by the inferior to the superior in rank. Terms of commendation thus paid being used by the receiver as verdicts and arguments to confirm and promote his usurpation.

9. The *want of moral courage on the part of the good, and of public virtue on the part of the bad*, encourages ambitious encroachments.

10. The use of *ambiguous terms*, or words containing a complimentary as well as an official sense—as head, prince, successor, authority—which being first applied in the courteous signification, come to suggest the assumption of the official power which at other times they are used to express.

11. The assumption of other *imposing and superlative terms*—as Catholic, or Universal, Apostolic See, *Prima Sedes*—which work on the fancy not only of ignorant, but of intelligent and sensible men.

And here, to supplement Barrow's remark under this head, how much does the Papacy owe to the use of such names by reigning Popes, as Innocent, Pius, Clement, and other appellations expressive of high-toned purity, while assumed by some of the most execrable wretches that have ever disgraced humanity, much more the profession of religion! How much has the work of the assassin prospered by consecrating the Inquisition with the sanctifying title of "The Holy Office!"

12. Subjects of real or supposed persecution, by *fleeing to the Bishop of Rome* for protection, enhanced both the Pope's pride and the Pope's power. Thus it was that Marchion, Fortunatus, Cyprian, and a host of others, by escaping to Rome for shelter, thereby contributed so much to augment the importance and pretensions of the Roman Bishops.

13. The disposition of Princes *to exalt themselves by exalting their Bishops* largely increased the rivalry and ambition of the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople—the respective emperors in each city feeling their own dignity affected by that of their chief Bishop.

14. The *early influence of the Bishop of Rome upon the legislation of the Christian emperors*, an influence which

often so moulded the Emperor's decrees as to favour the Pontiff's spiritual and secular ambition. Thus Baronius says—

“By this, reader, you understand that when the Emperors ordained laws concerning religion, they did it by transcribing and enacting the laws of the Church upon the admonition of the holy Bishops requiring them to do their duty.”

15. The *Pope's well-known influence at the Emperor's court* induced numbers to pay an exaggerated deference to his person and submission to his authority.

16. *The exemplary conduct of the early Bishops of Rome* threw around the seat of the Papacy a sanctified reverence, which served to disarm the Emperors' suspicion with regard to the dangerous consequences which were destined to result from the unbounded patronage bestowed on the Pope and clergy.

17. *The decline and troubles of the Roman Empire*, the consequent confusion of the times, and the mutual contentions among Princes, all afforded to the Pope openings or opportunities favourable to the rising influence and subsequent establishment of his power.

18. *The extinction of learning* by the disruptions of the Empire and the succeeding barbarism, allowed the Pope and clergy to become the almost exclusive depositories of whatever literature and learning escaped destruction, and enabled them to pursue a course of successful aggrandisement, by propagating any doctrines calculated to advance their temporal interests.

19. By siding with *factionous Churchmen against civil rulers*, as with Anselm (1109) and Becket (1154), the Pope strengthened his interest with the clerical body and weakened the control of the civil power.

20. The *heads, tongues, and pens of the clergy* being all employed in defence of the Papacy, served to silence the world into submission to the Pope's authority.

21. The policy of the Pope *in exempting the clergy from civil legislation*, while it appeared to advocate the liberty of the clergy, really bound them in stronger fetters to the rule of the Pope.

22. The *origin and organisation of religious orders*, deriving their privileges by charter from the Pope, raised up in each a regiment of spiritual janizaries, and created a standing army for the support of the Papacy.

23. *Wealth being the great sinew of power*, the Papacy employed successfully every means to increase the strength of that sinew.

24. The *dexterous application of theological dogmas* formed an effectual means of increasing the power, pelf, and pomp of the Papacy.

25. The *tendency of custom and time* to produce advocates in favour of power once established, and thus to favour future acquisitions and aggrandisements.

26. The *pictures drawn of heretics* by the agents of the Pope terrified numbers into submission to the Pope's authority, lest they should incur the ignominy attached to the crime of heresy.

27. The Papal power having to subjugate the Episcopacy within the Church and the civil ruler without it, *these two powers were constantly played off against each other* in such a way as to favour the subjugation of both to the Papal See.

28. The nominal *identity of the Pope's authority with the Chair of Peter* often afforded the Pope a means of successful defence, by threatening Peter instead of himself.

29. The *forgery of Decretal Epistles*, in which numerous of the early and more pious Popes are made to homologate usurpations which did not exist for centuries after, was of eminent service in fraudulently promoting the Pope's power.

30. Professing to bestow upon princes grants of power which they already possessed by right or custom.

31. Synods of bishops, styling themselves the "representatives of Christendom," were at the same time simply the representatives of the Pope's power, and passed in Council whatever the Pope dictated as favourable to his authority.

32. The *obligation of oaths*, beginning in the age of

Gregory VII.) by which the clergy were subjected to a sworn obedience to the Holy See, greatly confirmed the Pope's power.

33. The Pope's policy of first making some intolerable aggression upon the civil power, and then availing himself of the resistance offered to *negotiate for large concessions by compacts or concordats*.

34. Civil enactments unfavourable to the Papacy, and passed in the reign of a *strong prince*, were sure to be revoked by the influence of the Papacy upon a *weaker one*; as when Pope Leo induced Louis XI. to repeal the "Pragmatic Sanction" of his ancestors.

35. The spiritual powers of papal *absolution and dispensation* from the obligations of oaths and contracts, by accommodating the desires and easing the consciences of the rich and powerful, enabled the Pope to increase both his profit and power.

36. The *device of Indulgence* greatly enlarged the preceding means of commanding wealth and power.

The preceding may be taken as a comprehensive summary of those practical means by which the Papacy succeeded in acquiring political power and worldly wealth. But if we would trace political Romanism to the essential and general source of its power, and investigate the characteristic and most effective means by which it acquired its political ascendancy and temporal wealth, we must seek for them in the *influence of its religious creed*—a creed which both defines the tenets of Rome's religious faith, and the practical ordinances by which this belief has been originated, nourished, and made the

Spiritual Basis of Political Popery.

The general principle of such a basis has already been referred to under a prior head, (see "Political Development of Popery," preface, p. 7;) in which it was shown that Rome's assumed authority in relation to the soul, formed the foundation of her similar pretentious claims in reference to corporeal and temporal interests. Hence, as the latter pretension was built on the former, the first thing

necessary, on the part of the Church, was the exhibition of such a dogmatic system as should constitute the requisite basis for the erection of her temporal claims.

Such a doctrinal substratum could not, of course, be anywhere discovered in that written rule which equalises the spiritual prerogatives and saving privileges of the pastor and people ; so that even a commissioned apostle addressing a lay community disavowed all "dominion over their faith," (2 Cor. i. 24.) Hence it became necessary to supply the defect of Scripture in this respect by alleging the possession of a *second rule of faith, called Tradition*; the tenets of which, after many ages of unformulated existence in the Church, at length came to be embodied in the well-known summary of sacerdotal authority, called

The Creed of Pope Pius IV.

I. "I most steadfastly admit and embrace Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

II. "I also admit the Holy Scripture, according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures ; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

III. "I also profess, that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new law instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one ; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace ; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders cannot be reiterated without sacrilege : and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments.

IV. "I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

V. "I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead ; and that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood ; which conversion the (Roman) Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I

also profess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament.

VI. "I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

VII. "Likewise, that the Saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated; and that they offer up prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration.

VIII. "I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of the other Saints, may be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.

IX. "I also affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

X. "I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church, for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and I promise *and swear* true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

XI. "I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto, and all heresies, which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematised.

XII. "I, N. N. do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life.

"And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught, and preached by my subjects, or by those the care of whom shall appertain to me in my situation. This I promise, vow, and swear; so help me God, and these holy Gospels of God."

NOTE.—The words in italics in the tenth and twelfth articles are not employed in a Layman's profession of faith.

The Powers of Pope Pius IV.

The Creed has evidently been constructed with the single design of constituting the priest the exclusive and indispensable operator of salvation to the layman. Every article is one, in which the priest claims a spiritual capacity in relation to a spiritual benefit which the layman can only receive at the hands and option of his priestly master.

The several articles of the Creed, therefore, being simply the expression of so many spiritual powers, claimed by the Pope, and exercised through the agency of the priesthood,

the Creed of Pope Pius IV. is more consistently termed *the Powers* of Pope Pius IV.

The purport of the Creed, in this view of its character, will be made more apparent by the following—

PARAPHRASE OF THE CREED OR POWERS OF POPE PIUS IV.

Art. or power 1. The *power of the priest*, as the deputed preserver and expositor of “Apostolical and Ecclesiastical traditions,” and all other “constitutions and observances” of the Church.

Art. or power 2. The *power of the priest*, as the exclusive custodian, dispenser, and interpreter of the Scriptures.

Art. or power 3. The *power of the priest* to dispense or withhold the grace of the sacraments according to his “intention,” (Con. Trent, sess. 7, can. 11,) viz. :—

- (1.) His *power* to communicate or withhold the grace of regeneration in “Baptism.”
- (2.) His *power* to impart or withhold spiritual strength in the sacrament of “Confirmation.”
- (3.) His *power* to impart or withhold spiritual nourishment by the “Eucharist.”
- (4.) His *power* to “remit or retain” mortal sin by the sacrament of “Penance.”
- (5.) His *power* to remit or retain venial sin by “Extreme Unction.”
- (6.) His *power* to govern the soul in all its relations to God by the sacrament of “Orders.”
- (7.) His *power* to impart the grace which sanctifies marriage by the sacrament of “Matrimony.”

Art. or power 4. The *powers of the priest*, as defined by the Council of Trent, in relation to “Original Sin and Justification,”—powers equivalent to those associated respectively with the sacraments of Baptism and Penance.

Art. or power 5. The *power of the priest*, in relation to the mass and its associate ordinances, viz. :—

- (1.) His *power* to propitiate God, by this so-called sacrifice.
- (2.) His *power* to create the victim of the sacrifice by the process of transubstantiation.

- (3.) His *power* to consecrate and administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in "either kind alone."

Art. or power 6. The *power of the priest* to relieve and release the souls in purgatory.

Art. or power 7. The *power of the priest*, in relation both to the "saints reigning with Christ," and "their relics ;"—saints reigning with Christ being determined by the *power of canonisation*, and the relics of saints being distinguished and authenticated by *ecclesiastical examiners*.

Art. or power 8. The *power of the priest* to provide, appoint, and consecrate Images for the reception of "due honour and veneration."

Art. or power 9. The *power of the priest* to remit the temporal punishment due to sin, by "Indulgences."

Art. or power 10.—1st Part. The *power of the Church of Rome*, by which she claims to be "mother and mistress of all Churches."

Art. or power 10.—2d Part. The *power of the "Bishop of Rome,"* by which he claims "true obedience" from all Christians, in spirituals and temporals.

Art. or power 11. The *power of the priesthood* to legislate for the laity by "sacred canons" and "general councils," and to curse the contrary teaching.

Art. or power 12. The *power of the priest* to define the "Catholic faith," and to deny salvation to all who refuse to believe in the same.

Political Relations of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

If spiritual power is to be regarded as a basis for the claim and exercise of temporal authority on the part of the priest, the Creed of Pope Pius IV. furnishes a broad and ample foundation. If the priest has all the authority he here assumes over the "inward man," he certainly has an indisputable right to all the power he claims over the "outward man." Every dogma of this Creed is a link forged by the hand of despotism. Every tenet breathes tyranny. As a successful experiment upon human credulity, both for

the acquisition of political power and temporal wealth ; as an instrument by which the hopes and fears of the future world may be prostituted to the base purposes of furthering priestly ambition, avarice, and tyranny,—this Creed must ever be regarded as unrivalled, both with respect to the adaptation of the means, and the success which has attended their use.

The political relations of this comprehensive epitome of Popery are either such as flow from its influence as an instrument of superstition—an influence common to the whole of its contents—or such as result from the bearings of individual dogmas ; different dogmas affecting different temporal interests, or the same temporal interests in different ways. As a source of superstition, every article of the Creed furnishes the priest with a separate basis of temporal influence in the religious feelings of man. When the mind is once brought into harmony with the Pope's rule of faith, the priest becomes the jailer of the conscience ; or rather, (as the conscience always exercises its functions according to our belief,) by creating a rule of faith, which is essentially "another gospel," Popery virtually creates *another conscience*. A mind and conscience thus put into harmony with a creed which makes the priest the beginning, middle, and end of salvation, must invest him with unlimited authority over the spiritual man ; and to bring this influence to bear upon temporal conduct and temporal interests, the priest has only to show the subordinate relationship of temporal to eternal things, and by artful misrepresentations of this relationship, to rule the political through the religious man.

Popery obtains this dominion over the secular man and secular interests, by that skilful mingling of truth and falsehood which forms the great characteristic of the system. The truths and falsehoods, and their mode of combination in the present case, may be thus exhibited :—

First, It is a truth of the Christian religion that salvation depends upon the efficacy of the means of grace. According to scriptural teaching, such efficacy, however, entirely appertains to the mediatorial functions of Christ, independent of human agency. He alone can operate

grace in the chamber of the heart—the sanctuary in which “the High Priest of our profession” has the exclusive privilege of access, and the exclusive power to officiate. But Popery, by the doctrine of inherent sacramental efficacy and “sacerdotal intention,” assigns this power to the Romish priest. Here we have both a truth and a falsehood; and the following is the *rationale* of their combination in the doctrinal logic of Rome:—

First, Salvation depends upon the efficacy of the means of grace;

The efficacy of the means of grace depends upon the power of the priest;

Salvation depends upon the power of the priest.

Second, To show that this power extends to the control of temporalities, we have a similar combination of the true and false when Rome reasons thus:—

Temporal means are necessary to promote religious ends;

The priest has the rightful control of means necessary to religious ends;

The priest has the rightful control of temporal means.

Or thus:—

Temporal interests are subject to spiritual interests;

Spiritual interests are subject to the power of the priest;

Temporal interests are subject to the power of the priest.

By the use of such reasoning, propagated under every variety of representation, the priesthood of Rome has been able to accomplish in the moral world, what Archimedes vainly sought in the physical. Using the Creed as a lever, and resting this lever upon the fulcrum of human credulity, an ambitious and avaricious class forming a small minority in the aggregate of society, reduced the world for ages to the most abject serfdom.

But, as already intimated, the individual articles of this Creed have particular bearings upon particular temporal interests,—some affecting temporal liberty, some temporal property, some the ruler, some the subject, and so on; so

that the political relations of the Creed require an individual notice of the several articles or dogmas which go to compose this comprehensive summary of the Pope's doctrine and polity.

Political Relations of the First Article of the Creed.

"I most steadfastly admit and embrace Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same Church."

"Wolves shall succeed for teachers, grievous wolves,
Who all the sacred mysteries of heaven
To their own vile advantages shall turn
Of lucre and ambition, and the truth
With superstitions and traditions taint."—*Paradise Lost*.

In this article, the layman pledges himself to an unre-served obedience to the "same Church;" that is, the Church of the Nicene Creed—a creed which the Church of Rome constantly publishes, prefixed to her own creed, to propagate the notions that the two creeds are *the one creed*, and the two Churches *the one Church*. Rome rightly calculated that the vast majority of her people would, in this way, be kept ignorant of the fact that the Nicene Creed was composed and ratified twelve hundred years before with a conclusive *Amen*,—an expression which may be used with some variety of signification, but which, attached to a prayer, doxology, or creed, always denotes, *no more to be added*.

The first dogma in the first article, therefore, is *Church authority*, or belief in, and obedience to, the Church of Rome,—a doctrine which she has, consistently enough, made the opening tenet of her creed; seeing that every other Papal dogma is based upon this fundamental one of assumed and irresponsible power.

A doctrine which compels belief on *authority*, to the exclusion of *evidence*, however advantageous in promoting the aims of the Papacy, was so obviously inconsistent with the demands of reason, that even Rome saw the necessity of supporting her pretensions by something like an appeal to testimony. This testimony, as provided by the priests, she

calls *tradition*, or when applied to establish individual doctrines, *traditions*.

Political Relations of Tradition.

No instrumentality was ever more serviceable to the "vile advantages of lucre and ambition," which form the two staple objects of the Popish priest, than the device of tradition. We have seen, in a striking quotation from a Romish organ—the *Home and Foreign Review*—that the principle of growth called *Development* always

"Constrains the *mouthpiece of tradition* to conform itself to the new atmosphere with which it is surrounded."

The circumambient influence which is thus said to modify tradition may, of course, be a *political* as well as a religious atmosphere. In other words, the Church may accommodate her tradition to her political and secular, as well as her religious wants, or to prosecute "the vile advantages of lucre and ambition," as well as to spread her unscriptural superstition. Further, to facilitate the operations of the "mouthpiece," the Church has conveniently provided the distinction of—

Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions.

Apostolic Tradition originated with the apostles, and supplies the *meaning* of Scripture; that is, the doctrines which Popery professes to find in the meaning.

"To the Church the apostles delivered both the book and the true meaning of it."—*Douay Bible*, note on 2 Tim. iii. 16.

And, lest the word Church here should be taken to include laymen, we have another annotation to the following effect, in the original Douay Bible and Rhemish Testament, from which the notes of the present Roman Catholic Bible have been drawn, the editorial hand expunging such as the Church wished to keep out of sight in a Protestant kingdom.

"The whole doctrine of our Christianity being taught by the apostles, and delivered to their successors, and coming down from one bishop to another, is called the *depositum*; as it were a thing laid into their hands, and committed unto them to keep; which, be-

cause it passeth from hand to hand, from age to age, from bishop to bishop, without corruption, change, or alteration, is all one with tradition, and is the truth given unto the holy bishops to keep, *and not unto laymen.*”—*Rhemish Testament*, annotation on 1 Tim. vi. 20.

Next, Ecclesiastical Tradition is that which originated with the Church, after the age of the apostles, and supplies such teaching as the Church chooses to inculcate in addition to “both the book, and the true meaning of it.” We have thus two very distinct classes of tradition, Apostolical or *expository* tradition, and Ecclesiastical or *supplementary* tradition. Each of these traditions has its political relations, which are here consecutively noticed.

Political Relations of Apostolical Tradition.

Keeping in view that apostolic tradition signifies the teaching of the apostles, secretly transmitted to the priests as “the meaning of Scripture,”—that this apostolic meaning of the text is professedly supplied by the notes of the Douay Bible and *Rhemish Testament*, and that the present reference to these notes is limited to such portions of the apostolic teaching as involve *temporal connexions* and *political interests*, a few specimens of this kind of teaching are here subjoined.

1. Apostolic tradition, asserting the Pope’s power to inflict *corporeal penalties* for sin.

Matt. xvi. 19.—Whatsoever thou shalt bind, &c.

“All kinds of discipline and punishment of offenders, either spiritual, which directly is here meant, or corporeal, is comprised under the word bind.”

“To loose, is as the cause and the offender’s case requireth ; to loose them of any of their former bands,” &c.

“Finally, this whatsoever *excepteth nothing that is punishable or pardonable by Christ on earth* ; for he hath committed his power to Peter,” and “consequently to his successors,” &c.—*Annotations of Rhemish Testament on the passage.*

2. Apostolic tradition, asserting that bishops are to be honoured before the king.

1 Pet. ii. 13.—Be ye subject, &c.

“St Ignatius, Ep. ad Smyrnenes, where he exhorts them first to honour God, *next* the bishop, and *then* the king.”—*Ibid., in loco.*

3. Apostolical tradition for the punishment of heretics by *penal laws*.

Luke xiv. 23.—Compel them, &c.

“St Augustine also referreth this compelling to the penal laws which Catholic princes do justly use against heretics and schismatics, proving that they who are; by their former profession in baptism, subject to the Catholic Church, and are departed from the same after sects, may, and ought to be, compelled into the unity and society of the Universal Church.”—*Ibid.*, *in loco*.

4. Apostolic tradition exempting priests from *civil taxes*.

Matt. xvii. 26.—The children free, &c.

“Though Christ to avoid scandal paid tribute, yet, indeed, he sheweth that both himself ought to be free from such payments, (as being the king’s son,) and also his apostles, as being of his family, and in them their successors, *the whole clergy, who are called in scripture the lot and portion of the Lord.*”—*Ibid.*, *in loco*.

5. Apostolic tradition for the punishment and execution of heretics, when such can be accomplished with *safety to the Church*.

Matt. xiii. 29.—Lest, perhaps, gathering up the cockle (or tares) ye root up the wheat also with it.

“The good must tolerate the evil, when it is *so strong* that it cannot be redressed without danger and disturbance of the whole Church, and commit the matter to God’s judgment in the latter day. *Otherwise*, where ill men, be they heretics or other malefactors, may be punished or suppressed without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and ought, by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastised or executed.”—*Ibid.*, *in loco*.

Luke ix. 55.—He rebuked them, &c.

“Not justice nor all rigorous punishment of sinners is here forbidden, nor Elias’s fact reprehended, nor the Church or Christian princes blamed for putting heretics to death; but that none of these things should be done for desire of our particular revenge, or *without discretion*, and regard of their amendment and example to others. Therefore St Peter used his power upon Ananias and Sapphira when he struck them both down to death for defrauding the Church.”—*Ibid.*, *in loco*.

2 Tim. iii. 9.—But they shall proceed no further; for their folly, &c.

“All heretics in the beginning seem to have some show of truth.”

“But in a short time God detecteth them, and openeth the eyes of men to see their deceits; in so much that after the first brunt

they are maintained by force only; all wise men seeing their falsehood, though for fear of troubling the state of such commonwealths, where unluckily they have been received, *they cannot be so suddenly extirpated.*"—*Ibid.*, in loco.

Rev. xvii. 6.—And I saw the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, &c.

"The Protestants foolishly expound it (the woman) of Rome, for that they (of Rome) put heretics to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries; *but their blood is not the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors*; for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer."—*Ibid.*, in loco.

6. Apostolic tradition for the employment of the "secular arm" against heretics.

Acts xxv. 11.—For if I have injured them, &c.

"If St Paul, both to save himself from whipping and from death sought by the Jews, doubted not to claim succour from the Roman laws, and to appeal to Cæsar, the prince of the Romans, not yet christened, how much more may we call for aid of Christian princes and their laws, *for the punishment of heretics and for the Church's defence against them.*"—*St Aug.*, Ep. 50."

Political Relations of Ecclesiastical Tradition.

One of the most prominent and successful specimens of this style of ecclesiastical fabrication is the alleged celebrated gift of the Papal States to the Pope by Constantine the Great, early in the fourth century. This transaction was propagated and received by tradition in the world from an unknown beginning down to the period of the Reformation. And such was the universal credit given to this now famous forgery that, so late as the year 1478, some Roman Catholics, more enlightened than their fellows, were burned at the stake in Strasburg for attempting to call in question the authenticity of the venerable lie, which, according to the best investigators of the present day, was broached between the middle and the end of the eighth century.

The Roman Catholic historian, the Abbé Fleury, after exposing the falsehood of this traditional forgery, supplies a copy of the instrument, from which some lines are here extracted:—

"We (Constantine) attribute to the See of St Peter all the dig-

nity, all the glory, all the authority of the imperial power. Furthermore, we give to Sylvester, (the reigning Pope then,) and to his successors, our palace of the Lateran, which is indubitably the finest palace on earth. We give him our crown, our mitre, our diadem, and all our imperial vestments. We transfer to him the imperial dignity. We bestow on the Holy Pontiff, in free gift, the city of Rome, and all the western cities of Italy; also the western cities of every other country. To cede precedence to him, we divest ourselves of our authority over all those provinces, and we withdraw from Rome, transferring the seat of our empire to Byzantium; inasmuch as it is not proper that an earthly emperor should preserve the least authority where God has established the head of his religion."—*Fleury's Fourth Discourse on Ecclesiastical History*.

"Such was the gift, with reverence be it said,
Which Constantine to good Sylvester made."

The Pope's title to the gift, however, came to be afterwards disputed by the Lombard kings, which caused the "head of the Church" to seek the protective friendship of Pepin and Charlemagne, kings of France in succession. In his application to the first of these, the Pope conceived that his suit would be more successful if backed by the personal interposition of the apostle Peter. Accordingly, an "ecclesiastical tradition" was speedily set afloat, alleging that a letter addressed to Pepin by the apostle Peter himself was sent by an unknown messenger to Pope Stephen, who posted it to Pepin with all due speed, the following being the chief contents:—

"Peter, called to the apostolate by Jesus Christ the Son of the living God," &c.

"As by me the Roman Church, of which Stephen is bishop, is founded upon the stone I adjure you, O excellent Pepin, Charles, and Carloman, three kings, and with you the bishops, abbes, priests, and monks, and also the dukes, counts, and people. . . . I adjure you, and with me the Virgin Mary, the angels, the martyrs, and all the other saints, adjure you not to suffer that my city of Rome and my people be any longer left a prey to the Lombards. . . . If you obey me quickly, you shall in this life receive an abundant recompense for it; you shall overcome your enemies; you shall live long; you shall eat the fat of the land, and you shall besides receive eternal life. If you obey me not, know that, by the authority of the Holy Trinity and of my apostolate, you shall be deprived of the kingdom of God."

"This letter (says Fleury) gives us to learn the genius of the age, and to what extent the most grave of mankind may carry fiction

when they consider it useful."—*Fleury's Ecclesiastical History*, Book 43, No. 17.

Apparently influenced by this "fiction," Pepin speedily relieved the Pope; and according to a third ecclesiastical tradition, renewed the donation of Constantine by two successive grants made respectively in the years 753 and 754.

Thus, tradition has handed down more things than doctrine in the Church of Rome. The history of Peter's patrimony evidently reveals the fact that the Pope is largely indebted to tradition for his present kingdom, and this instrument of priestcraft has constituted the chief means by which the political usurpations and impostures of the Papacy have been so successfully established in all ages of the world.

Utilitarian Basis of Tradition.

To lie for a "good cause" is not only an ethical privilege, but a positive merit, according to the moral system of Rome, as "developed" in the casuistic theology of St Liguori. That at least many of the ecclesiastical fabrications called tradition owe their origin to this principle of Popish morality, is evidenced by the preceding testimony of Abbe Fleury, when he says of the alleged gift of Constantine, "it gives us to perceive to what extent the gravest of mankind" (*i.e.*, the Romish priesthood, whom he thus designates or includes in his reference) "may carry fiction *when they consider it useful.*"

One falsehood usually begets many others. Hence to support the original fable respecting the gift of Constantine, succeeding traditions were devised after the ages of Pepin and Charlemagne, and again after the age of Louis le Debonnaire, son and successor to Charlemagne, to the effect that each of these monarchs both confirmed and enlarged the gift of Constantine to the Holy See. It does not appear that either originals or copies of the alleged gifts of Pepin and his son Charlemagne have been preserved, or if in being they have not been seen; but the alleged grants of Louis, who professes to confirm those of

his father and grandfather, are said to be preserved, in the terms of the following testament :—

“In the name of the Lord God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I, Louis, august Emperor, give, concede, and confirm, by this present covenant, to the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and through him to his vicar, Don Pascal, sovereign Pontiff and universal Pope, and to his successors in perpetuity, all that which they have received from our predecessors,” &c.

The deed then proceeds to the expression of details—details which furnish the critical historian with evidence that this grant, like the preceding one of Constantine, is a pure fabrication, designed on the principle that the possessions which it professed to convey were for the “good of the Church,” and that the end both justified and sanctified the means.

These means being found so successful in securing to the Pope the temporalities and powers of his Italian kingdom, he was induced to try the same experiment on a larger scale, with a view to extend his dominions not only over Peter’s patrimony or the “grant of Constantine,” but over the kingdoms and states of other monarchs, or rather of all other monarchs. Accordingly, a collection of traditions were fabricated, and put in circulation during the eighth century, under the name of the “Decretals or Epistles of Isadore,” meaning hereby a collection of documents collected by Isadore, but alleged to be epistles of early popes and canons of early councils ; and to these forgeries may be chiefly attributed the rapid strides which from this date the Pope made in the acquisition of that temporal supremacy which he afterwards so far usurped.

That these Decretals, which constitute a subject of special importance in the development and study of political Popery, were broached on the utilitarian plea, is thus evidenced by the historian Mosheim, and his editorial translator Dr Murdoch,—

“To bring men to listen and assent to the new system of Ecclesiastical law, (claiming jurisdiction for the Pope in temporals as well as spirituals over the whole Church,) so very different from the previous system, there was need of ancient documents and records with which it might be enforced and defended against the assaults of op-

ponents. Hence the Roman Pontiffs procured the forgery by their trusty friends, of Conventions, Acts of Councils, Epistles, and other documents, by which they might make it appear that, from the earliest ages of the Church, the Roman Pontiffs possessed the same authority and power which they now claimed (viz., in the eighth century).

"Among these fraudulent documents in support of the Romish power, the so-called Decretal Epistles of the Pontiffs of the early centuries hold perhaps the first rank. They were produced by the ingenuity of an obscure man who falsely assumed the name of Isadore, Bishop of Seville."—*Mosheim's Eccles. Hist.*, p. 296. Lond., 1861.

So far Mosheim. These Decretals, ascribed to Bishop Isadore, as their collector and compiler in the sixth century, when fabricated by the hireling of the Pope, were brought from Spain into Germany by Reculphus, Bishop of Mayence, and thence put in circulation about the year 760. Further particulars are thus added by Dr Murdoch's note:—

"In that age *frauds for the benefit* of the Church and of God were deemed lawful, so that it is not strange that the Roman Pontiffs should suppose they did no moral wrong by permitting and approving the fabrication of such papers as would be a rampart and bulwark to the See of St Peter.

"That the author of these Epistles wished to be regarded as Isadore, a distinguished Spanish bishop of the sixth century; or to speak more definitely, that he wished to make the world believe that these Epistles were collected by Isadore, is perfectly clear.

"The bishops were accustomed, in token of their humility, to subjoin to their names the word *peccator* (sinner). Hence the author of this forgery annexed the surname Peccator to the assumed name Isadore. Some of the transcribers, ignorant of the ancient customs and literature, corrupted this signature by exchanging Peccator for Mercator; and hence the fraudulent compiler of the Decretal Epistles is called Isadore Mercator."—*Ibid.*

Lest these statements should be supposed to be the coloured effusions of Protestant and prejudiced pens, a few sentences from Abbe Fleury are further subjoined on the subject of these Isadorean Epistles:—

"Leo IX., and the Popes who undertook to repair the ruins of the tenth age, and to restore the Roman Church to its ancient glory, endeavoured to re-establish its temporal power, which they founded in the first place on the Donation of Constantine, and after that on those made by Pepin and Charlemagne, by Lewis the Debonair, and Otho. Every one now knows what the donation

of Constantine is, and the falsity of it is more universally acknowledged than that of Isadore's Decretals." Again, "In this intelligent age of ours, are the Donation of Constantine and Isadore's Decretals any longer to be endured? And if these pieces are not to be maintained, can we approve of the consequences that flow from them?"—*Fleury's Fourth Discourse on Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 238, 266. Lond. 1721.

It need only be added, that the alleged productions of Isadore, (professing to include epistles written by popes, beginning with Clemens, successor to Peter, and ascribing to the writers all the powers which the pope, who forged them, wished to possess,) although now given up by Roman Catholics themselves, formed for ages the chief elements of Canon Law on the subject of the pope's prerogatives, and have never even yet been repealed or expunged from the statute-book of Rome, on the ground of their demonstrated falsehood.

Relation of Tradition to "Development."

Since the adoption of the new canonical principle called Development, the Protestant inquirer must be prepared for a large amount of shuffling on the part of Romish controversialists, in order to adjust the new to the old rule of faith. Of course, Rome cannot afford to shelve the old rule called Tradition, but henceforth its office must be greatly modified; and it is not improbable that the modification may include an attempt to prove that Tradition and Development, so far from being at mutual variance, mean the *same thing*!

The probability of such a plan of reconciliation has been suggested by reading some views advanced by a present-day bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, who attributes to Tradition a *progressive growth* similar to, and no doubt suggested by, Newman's Development. Here are some of the statements of this decided improvement on Newman. Bishop Brown is speaking of the sources in which tradition is to be found:—

"Many appear in the decisions of several general councils, and may easily be met with by consulting either the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and the Catechism of the Council of Trent, or persons versed in theology or ecclesiastical history. *It is probable also that there still remain some other Divine traditions regarding points upon which the Church has not yet decided, preserved in the writings of the Fathers,*

and in the custody of the universal Church, TO BE ELICITED whenever circumstances shall render the decisions of the Church, or, in other words, their production, necessary, by the same means as have been adopted in times past, from the Council of Nice to the Council of Trent."
—Substance of the Arguments used at the Cheltenham Discussion by the Rev. T. J. Brown, S.T.P., p. 41.

Thus, instead of holding, with Newman, that doctrines are developed independently of tradition—that they are suggested by, and originated from, new conditions and new wants in the Church, Bishop Brown's view goes to maintain that the doctrinal wants of the Church were all supplied by tradition from the first; but these traditions, like geological fossils, lie deeply buried in the tomes of the Fathers, and are only to be extricated from this sacred soil as the force of circumstances shall render their production necessary. Thus, when the Church found it necessary to establish the doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception," for which Bishop Milner says there *was no tradition discoverable in his day* ("End of Controversy," Letter 12), a tradition was "elicited" which made a revelation of that doctrine to the Church, and the Pope accordingly defined it as a necessary addition to his creed.

Such a theory, of course, possesses a decided advantage over Newman's scheme of development, inasmuch as it preserves intact the old traditional system, while it accommodates the Church with a rule which not only accounts for the growth of her creed in times past, but supplies her with means by which she can still add to the stock of her religious dogmas, "as circumstances render their production necessary."

Political Relations of the Second Article of the Creed.

"I also admit the Holy Scripture, according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

"For the Spirit

Pour'd forth on His apostles, whom He sends
 To evangelise the nations, then on all
 Baptised, shall them with wondrous gifts endue
 To speak all tongues, and do all miracles,
 As did their Lord before them. Thus they win

Great numbers of each nation to receive
With joy the tidings brought from heaven. At length,
Their ministry perform'd and race well run,
Their doctrine and their story written, left."—*Paradise Lost*.

Political Relations of the Bible.

Although "the doctrine and story of the apostles" have for their ultimate and special object the interest of mankind in a future life, yet this revelation, so far from overlooking the secular relations of the human family, is no less the Divine charter of political than religious freedom—of social than of personal privilege.

The evidence of the Bible itself to this effect is amply verified by the history of its influence in the world. Such history sufficiently testifies that, as it was the progressively increasing dearth of the divine oracles which permitted the corresponding development of Popery in civil usurpation, as well as religious novelties, it was the rediscovery and diffusion of the Sacred Volume which restored Protestant Christendom to political as well as religious freedom. Space permits but the briefest reference to this class of historical testimony.

The zeal of the early Christian teachers was found to multiply converts faster than they could multiply the means of Scriptural instruction. The so-called "successors of the apostles" vastly increased this disproportion between the number of converts and the means to instruct them, by substituting baptism for the gospel as the instrument of conversion. The preacher became a mere "baptising machine," and nominal Christians were multiplied with a rapidity which totally outstripped the utmost industry in the provision of means to enlighten them in the simplest elements of Christianity. The Scriptures were then produced by the slow process of the manual transcriber, and, as a matter of course, no amount of diligence or labour could make the supply equal to the demand created by the priest's expeditious mode of manufacturing converts. Hence, the churches were early and every where filled with a membership depending for religious knowledge upon such in-

struction as the priests were disposed to impart ; and the latter, taking advantage of a state of things in which disciples had no means of testing the character of the principles taught, speedily introduced those unscriptural novelties in dogma and polity which are now designated Tradition and Development.

The doctrine and policy thus developed are, as we have seen, represented by the Creed of Pope Pius IV.,—which, compared with the Nicene Creed, has this remarkable peculiarity, that, while no article in the Nicene includes the most distant reference to the office, much less the power of priest or pope, every article in the Creed of Pope Pius IV. has for its object to define and establish some arbitrary power of both. Thus, whatever may be the particular tenet referred to Tradition or Development for its authority, the tradition or development invariably runs in the one channel, the channel of priestly power either in religion or politics, or rather in both.

After twelve centuries of a double usurpation thus acquired and exercised by the Romish priesthood, or in the very midnight of history, the Papacy was suddenly awakened from the deep slumbers of mediæval security by the advancing tramp of the Waldensian host preaching the Bible instead of Tradition, and Christ instead of the Pope. The Pope, suddenly surprised by the strange aggression, and unable at first to organise a more effective agency for dealing with his opponents, immediately commissioned St Dominick to meet them with their own weapons of preaching and argument ; while, in the meantime, the head of the Church, who placed little dependence in these modes of controversy, and who considers it his mission neither to convince nor convert, but to subjugate his adversaries, speedily prepared to meet the impending danger with the Montfort crusade, and a newly-devised gospel instrumentality, to which he gave the name of “The Inquisition.”

These means of suppressing Scriptural testimony succeeded entirely to the Pope’s satisfaction, until human thought flashed forth the bright conception of the printing press—the magic messenger of mind—the harbinger of

universal knowledge—the preceptor of the million—the destined emancipator of man from the bondage of Popery—and, above all, the miraculous multiplier of that sacred volume, whose leaves, like the mystic foliage of the tree of life, are for “the healing of the nations.”

Rome vanquished all previous opponents ; but the new engine of thought speedily proved a mightier power than the crusader’s sabre or the inquisitor’s fagot. The strong man armed found that a stronger than he was come. But to fulfil the Divine purpose against the Papacy, the engine required an engineer qualified for the effective use of the new power, and God providentially supplied the one as timely as He sent the other—the means and the man came, as it were, together. Furnished with an instrumentality thus prepared to his hand, as by a special providence—the only instrumentality which was capable of effecting man’s deliverance from the worse than Egyptian bondage of the Papacy,—Luther newly delivered the message of Moses to the Vatican Pharaoh—“Let my people go that they may serve me ;” and the Protestant Exodus commenced with the double result of that religious and political freedom which the Bible, and the Bible only, could have procured for man. Why this book, which all agree was designed to favour true religion, should operate so perversely as invariably to create a partiality for any form of Protestantism rather than the principles of Popery, is left to the Romish infallibles to determine, but the fact itself is made evident by the

Policy of Popery in Relation to the Bible.

The policy of Popery, in relation to the Sacred Volume, like many other peculiarities of the system, did not receive its full “development” till called forth by the exigencies of the Reformation. This policy then assumed a distinct and decisive claim, first, to the possession of an exclusive power, a Divine patent, for the correct interpretation of the Holy Scriptures ; and second, to the possession and control of the book itself, as a matter of civil property.

With reference to the first of these claims it is evident that, if, as we have seen, the Bible is a book to guide and

govern man in his political as well as his spiritual relations—if the Sacred Word is the charter of the civil as well as the religious rights of the race—it follows that any power professing an exclusive claim to determine the signification of Scripture, must seek to extend this claim to the province of politics as well as the sphere of religion. And, in point of fact, this has always been the claim of the Papacy. Hence the Papal assumption of an exclusive and Divine right to expound the Bible, is a matter of not less importance to the political than the spiritual interests of Christendom.

To secure her monopoly of a “Divine right” to expound the Divine Word, Rome tells us that the book of God is a padlocked revelation which can only be opened by the key of Tradition, and that as she alone is privileged to carry this “key of knowledge”—she alone is empowered to discharge the duty of interpreting the Divine will, both in relation to the interests of time and eternity. These pretensions necessitate a special and fundamental examination of the

Mutual Relations of Scripture and Tradition.

In the doctrinal system of the Papacy, Scripture and Tradition are declared to be correlative parts of the same revelation—the same rule of faith; and in explaining the relationship between these parts, we are told that the office of Tradition is to supply the interpretation necessary both to expound and attest the teaching of the written Word,—an office thus expressed by the Roman Catholic Bishop Milner in the large capitals with which he has made this office conspicuous in the following extract:—

“If, then, Satan and his disciples the heretics (or Protestants, to whom his strictures here apply) are capable of thus perverting holy Scripture, how are Catholics, the children of the Church, to make use of them so as to discern truth from falsehood?

“(Ans.) They must carefully observe the rule laid down at the beginning of this treatise, by the holy and learned men I referred to—**THEY ARE TO INTERPRET THE DIVINE TEXT ACCORDING TO THE TRADITION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.**”

The Bishop then subsequently makes the remarkable concession, that—

“The Church does not dictate an exposition of the whole Bible, because she has no Tradition concerning a very great proportion of it.”—*End of Religious Controversy*, Letter 12.

Hence if Catholics, the children of the Church, are to observe this “rule,” obviously the first thing requisite for the children is to know what are the Scriptures for which the Church *has*, and what are those for which the Church has *not*, the necessary expository tradition. If, according to the second article of the creed, we are to admit the Scriptures only “according to the sense of the Church,”—if this sense is only to be derived from tradition, and if the Church has no tradition—not merely for a *portion* of Scripture, nor even for a *great* proportion of it, but for “a *very* great proportion of it,” it arithmetically follows that a *very small* proportion of Scripture can be safely or certainly interpreted even by a “Council with a Pope at its head,” much less by a bishop, priest, or layman. As this proportion is so “very small,” the Church is the more inexcusable for having so long neglected to define with the necessary precision the parts of Scripture to which her Scriptural rule of faith is confined, that her children might have the benefit of consulting the “divine text,” according to Bishop Milner’s rule to “discern truth from falsehood.”

This reference to truth and falsehood, which Bishop Milner says is only to be determined by traditional testimony, leads us in the next place to examine the soundness of the Church’s theology in relation to this alleged evidential office of her Tradition. According to her theology, Tradition is at once an interpretation of the Scripture text, and a witness to its veracity—a doctrine which is easily shown to be just the *true rule reversed*—an exact perversion of the

True Relationship of Scripture and Tradition.

That is, instead of Tradition being the interpreter and witness of Scripture, Scripture is the interpreter and witness of Tradition. It is scarcely necessary to consult Blackstone on Evidence, (book iii., chap. 23,) to expose the false position of the Papacy on the relations of Scripture

and Tradition. By referring to that authority, however, it will be found that the office of a witness is not to supply a revelation of facts, but to testify to the veracity or falsehood of information already supplied by one or other of the parties in the case or cause at issue; and for this purpose *written evidence* bearing a due relation to such case or cause is just as valid, or rather more so, than personal testimony.

Hence it is clear that a revelation of facts, or alleged facts, must always precede the office or exercise of testimony relating to the same. Hence, also, if tradition is a witness to the facts or veracity of Scripture, then Scripture must have preceded Tradition as a revelation of facts; but if Scripture testifies to the facts of Tradition, then Tradition must be the prior revelation and Scripture the witness. Now, the Church of Rome herself admits and strenuously maintains that her doctrines were not only delivered prior to the written Scriptures, but that the whole Christian system was traditionally taught ere the apostles committed the same to writing. This being the case, the chronological relationship of Tradition and Scripture clearly opposes the view held by Rome, and proves the

Scripture the Expositor and Witness of Tradition.

To illustrate and fully establish this mutual relationship of the spoken and written word, we have only to refer to some of the remarkable circumstances connected with the delivery of the Decalogue. We learn that the Ten Commandments were in the first instance delivered traditionally by the mouth of Jehovah himself. And the subject-matter of this tradition was altogether so brief and simple that no part of revelation could have been more easily preserved and transmitted by traditional means. But the Divine Legislator was too well aware of the untrustworthy character of such a channel to leave even this small item of revelation depending upon "the priest's lips that *should* keep knowledge, . . . but caused many to stumble at the law," (Mal. ii. 7, 8.)

He knew that Tradition was not merely unsafe as an

instrument of transmission, but was especially devoid of those characteristics essential to the purpose of *testimony*. Hence an instrument capable of testimony was provided in those stony tablets, which were hewn from the laminated peaks of Sinai, and upon which Jehovah himself recorded the "ten words," which He had previously spoken from the burning summit of the trembling mount.

To demonstrate the designed evidential character of the written decalogue, or that its object was to bear testimony to the tenor and teaching of the vocal delivery of the law, the tablets delivered to Moses are expressly called the "Tables of *Testimony*," (Exod. xxxi. 18 ;) and the ark or chest in which they were deposited is further called the "Ark of the *Testimony*," (Exod. xxx. 6 ;) while the tabernacle itself, or at least the inner department of it, the "Holy of Holies," wherein these and the other Scripture records came to be kept, was called the "Tabernacle of *Testimony*," (Exod. xxxviii. 21.)

There can be no occasion to enlarge upon the fact that, as the written decalogue was given to verify the substance and signification of the traditional one, the Scriptures at large were similarly given to testify to the substance, signification, and veracity of the several parts of revelation which the prophets and apostles first delivered traditionally, and then—

"Their ministry perform'd and race well run,
Their doctrine and their story written, left."

The two great divisions of Scripture, like the two great divisions of the Law, being designed as evidential records, are for this reason with the greatest propriety called *Testaments*. Numerous individual texts in each also assign to them a testamentary character, witnessing not merely between God and man, but between man and man, and more especially between the official teacher and his disciples :—

Isa. viii. 20.—To the law and to the *testimony* : if they speak not according to this word, &c.

Rom. iii. 21.—But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being *witnessed* by the law and the prophets.

The real office of the Scripture, then, as distinct from

tradition, is not to *reveal* but to *testify*—not to make a primary discovery of truth, but to testify to the substance and signification of truth already revealed. Although this testimony indirectly serves the purposes,—all the necessary purposes of a revelation,—yet this does not alter the distinctive character of the Scripture as a testament or witness of the facts and faith, which, however traditionally given, could only be scripturally preserved.

By altering or reversing the true relationship of Scripture and Tradition—by assuming that the teaching of Tradition testifies to the signification and veracity of the Scriptures, instead of the Scriptures fulfilling this office in relation to Tradition—the Papacy fashioned a weapon with which it could dexterously meet all its opponents. Scripture thus made plastic by the modifying glosses of an alleged Tradition, is precisely the “nose of wax” which the Romish doctor Pighius designates the Bible in any other hands than those of the Church, (*Third Book of Controversies de Ecclesia.*) By such traditional glosses the Papacy easily moulds the nose of wax into any form necessary to harmonise with the novel features which are every day being “developed” on the face of the Man of Sin; and perhaps the principle of argument, to which attention has been directed in the remarks under the present head will be found the only effectual one both to repel the accusation of Pighius, and to lay the burden of his charge at the door of his own Church.

After all, the Bible interpreted by Tradition is not the Church of Rome’s rule of faith; for while, according to Milner, Scripture is interpreted by Tradition, he elsewhere shows that this Tradition has to be again explained by the Church. His words are—

“The Catholic rule of faith is Scripture and tradition, and these expounded and explained by the Catholic Church.”—*End of Religious Controversy*, Letter 10.

By the Catholic Church, Milner here, as usual, means the Catholic priest; and by “propounding and explaining,” he does not mean the priest’s decision according to evidence, but according to *authority* :—

"While this rule and this authority (in explaining it) are acknowledged, there can be no heresy or schism among Christians. . . .

"And the pastors of the Church who possess this authority are always living and ready to declare what is the sense of Scripture and what the tradition upon each contested point, which they have received in succession from the apostles."—*Ibid.*, Letter 11.

Hence the true basis of all belief in the system of Popery is simply the priest's authority; and as belief founded upon the authority of the teacher is not belief in his teaching, but a belief in the teacher,—is not faith in the principles "propounded and explained," but in the *propounder* and *explainer*,—it follows that the real rule of faith in "the Catholic Church" is the *priest himself*.

But next, Popery claims not merely an exclusive power over the meaning and ministrations of the Sacred Volume, but an exclusive right to the civil possession and control of the volume itself. Hence Milner says—

"The pastors of the Church (of Rome) have received the inheritance of the truth with the succession of their sees," and that hence their opponents "ought not to be allowed to argue at all from Scripture."—Letter 10.

Agreeably to the spirit of this doctrine, the Church has long assumed the province of a political legislature in relation to the Scripture, a province which leads us in the next place to examine the

Political Legislation of Popery in Relation to the Bible.

The legislative machinery of the Papacy is centralised in Rome in the form of certain legal corporations which bear the name of "Congregations." Thus the corporation appointed to regulate or supervise the proceedings of the Roman and other local Inquisitions is called the "Congregation of the Holy Office."

Prior to the Reformation and the invention of printing, the means of circulating opinion were so limited that the Church had comparatively little difficulty in dealing with the outbreaks of heresy, and she found a sufficient instrumentality in the power of her Inquisitorial system. But the progress of the Reformation under the support of a

printed literature speedily convinced the Church that the Congregation of the Holy Office was no longer sufficient to meet her necessities, and that if she would stem the movement of the Reformers, she must supplement her Inquisition for the trial and prosecution of heretics by one for the trial and prosecution of *printers*. The corporation appointed to this new "Holy Office" she calls

The Congregation of the Index.

Papal legislation against the press commenced with the 5th Council of Lateran, A.D. 1515. That Council, under Leo X., in the 10th session, alleges that the invention of printing originated the necessity for the interference of the Church in relation to the exercise of that art, and expresses its decision on the liberties of the press in the following decree :—

"That for all future time no one shall presume to print or cause to be printed any book, or other writing, as well in our city (the city of Rome) as in any other state or diocese, unless first diligently examined and approved by subscription under their hands, in the city of Rome, of our vicar and the master of our Sacred Palace; but in other states and dioceses of the bishop or some other qualified person deputed by them and by the inquisitor of heretical wickedness of the diocese."—*Labbe and Cossart's Councils*, vol. xiv. p. 257.

This decree, to which are appended numerous heavy penalties, merely enunciated a legislative principle which was found to be deficient in its practical application for want of more definite provisions. Hence in the year 1559 the Inquisition at Rome, by the sanction of Paul V., to give facilities to the application of the above decree, published an *Index*, or specialised list, of such works as they condemned for containing principles opposed to the teaching of the Church, to which Index was also appended a list of sixty publishers, with a prohibition forbidding all "the faithful" to read or possess any work whatever issuing from any of the said publishers.

But these legislative provisions still fell far short of producing the desired effect on the progress of literature, and especially upon the rapid production and circulation of that

Scriptural literature which formed so congenial a handmaid to religion. Hence, the Council of Trent had scarcely met in 1545, when the patristic owls of that assembly set about framing a course of restrictive measures against the Bible, and before they concluded,—viz., in the 18th session,—the Council, or a committee appointed by the Council, fixed the constitution of the above congregation, called the Congregation of the Index, not only for the suppression of the Bible, but of all literature judged by the body to be adverse to the principles of the Papacy. The Roman court so-called being thus permanently established, has ever since continued to exercise its powers over the productions of the press wherever the Papacy can bring these powers to bear. To this end the Congregation of the Index holds its sittings in Rome, where it examines productions of the press, or intended productions of the press in MS.; its ministrations and decisions in relation to such productions being given to the world in the occasional publication of two works, entitled respectively,

The Index Librorum Prohibitorum,

AND

The Index Librorum Expurgatorium.

The INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM, or the Index of *Prohibited Books*, contains a list of books examined between certain dates, and altogether condemned by the Congregation of the Index as dangerous to the doctrine and interests of the Church.

The INDEX LIBRORUM EXPURGATORIUM is a similar work, containing a catalogue of books in which the authors, submitting to the authority of the Congregation of the Index, allowed their productions to be “purged,” that is, altered according to the directions of the Roman Court, either in MS., or (if printed) in future editions published with the authority of the Index.

Every Index, whether Prohibitory or Expurgatory, embraces a set of ten general rules, called the “Rules of the Index,” because they were first published with the Index prepared by the authority of the Council of Trent. These

rules form the canon law of the Church on the subject of books; and a few excerpts, by way of illustrating the character of these enactments, chiefly in relation to the Bible, are subjoined.

Excerpt from Rule 1.—“All books condemned by the supreme Pontiffs or General Councils previous to the year 1515, though not contained in the present Index, (that published by authority of the Council of Trent,) are nevertheless to be considered as condemned.”

Excerpt from Rule 2.—“The books of heresiarchs, whether of those who broached or disseminated their heresies prior to the year above mentioned, or of those who have been, or are, the heads or leaders of heretics, as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, &c., . . . are altogether forbidden, whatever may be their names, titles, or subjects. And the books of other heretics which treat professedly on religion are (also) totally condemned. But those which do not treat upon religion are allowed to be read, after having been *examined and approved by Catholic divines*, by order of the bishops and inquisitors.”

Excerpt from Rule 3.—“Translations of the Old Testament may be allowed, but only to learned and pious men, at the discretion of the bishop. . . . But translations of the New Testament, made by authors of the first class of this Index, are allowed to no one, since little advantage, but much danger, generally arises from reading them.”

Excerpt from Rule 4.—“Forasmuch as it is manifest from experience that, if the Holy Bible translated into the vulgar tongue be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is on this point referred to the judgment of the bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, *permit the reading of the Bible*, translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety they apprehend will be augmented and not injured by it, and this *permission they must have in writing*. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary.

“Booksellers who shall sell or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use, and to be subject to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence.”

“Finally, it is enjoined on all the faithful, that no one presume to read or keep any books contrary to these rules, or prohibited by this Index. But if any one read or keep any books composed by heretics, or the writings of any author suspected of heresy or false doctrine, he shall instantly incur the sentence of excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted on some other account,

besides the mortal sin committed, shall be severely punished at the will of the bishops."—*Labbei, S. S. Concilia*, tom. xiv., pp. 952–956.

According to the tenor of these extracts, the Congregation of the Index are opposed to the production and use only of such versions of the Scripture as derive their existence and circulation from heretical authors. But that this is merely a blind to conceal that policy by which the Church seeks the universal disuse and suppression of the Bible, is evident from the fact, that versions published by its own official membership have been placed under the ban of the Index in common with those of the heretic. Thus even Martini's Bible, an Italian version of the Scriptures, by the Roman Catholic Bishop so-called, although at first published with the sanction of Pope Pius VI., was subsequently placed in the Index by the next Pope, Pius VII., in a decree bearing date January 17, 1820. Hence the rescript of Pius VI., which is placed in the front of the present Douay Bible, involves a violation of the restriction imposed on Martini's Bible by his successor. But this violation is quite in accordance with the accommodating character of the Index, as explained by Doctor Peter Dens, who says,—

"It was received and observed in the whole of that part of the world which was completely Catholic. *It was more dispensed with only where Catholics lived among heretics.*"—*Dens' Theol.*, vol. ii., p. 103.

Thus open restrictions, relative to the use of the Bible, are dispensed with in the British territories; but when the country is "completely Catholic," no such indulgence is allowed, as exemplified in the subjoined testimony of the Spanish priest Balmez, quoting his fellow-religionist Carranza :—

"In Spain, which was, and still is, by the grace and goodness of God, pure from the cockle, care was taken to forbid generally all the translations of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongues, in order to prevent strangers having an opportunity of holding controversy with simple and ignorant persons, and also because they had, and still have, experience of certain particular cases, and of the errors which began to arise in Spain from the ill-understood reading of certain passages of the Bible. What I have just stated is the real history of what took place; this is why the Bible in the vulgar tongue was prohibited."—*Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their Effects*

on the Civilisation of Europe. By the Rev. J. Balmez, p. 172. London, James Burns, 1849.*

As another testimony to the legislative prohibition of the Bible in Spain, the following is supplied by Alphonsus a Castro, one of the bishops of the Council of Trent :—

“One of the parents and springs of heresy was the translation of the Holy Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, and therefore great praises are bestowed on the edict of Ferdinand and Elizabeth, king and queen of Spain, by which they had *forbidden, under the severest penalties*, either to translate the Holy Scriptures into the vulgar tongues, or to keep any translation made of them, under any pretence whatever.”—Lib. i., *Contr. Hær.* c. 13.

Hence all the rules of the Index, respecting the circumstances in which the Bible is to be permitted or else prohibited by the Church, may be reduced to one general rule comprehensive of the whole, namely—*The Church prohibits the Scriptures wherever she has power to enforce the prohibition, and she permits their use wherever she has no power to prevent it.*

The vast and rapidly-expanding operations of the press are every day reducing the prohibitive power of Popery in relation to literature, and rendering the Index of the Church a nominal censorship, which no power short of omnipotence itself could find means to enforce. The Church, therefore, finding that she could no longer pretend to monopolise and control the Scriptures as a civil possession or as a matter of civil property, has long used all other means at her command to limit the use and diminish the influence of the Divine Word. A comprehensive view of the various forms in which Rome has exercised her malignant power to restrict the use and neutralise the influence of the Sacred Scriptures, would require a considerable-sized volume, under each of the following heads :—

1. Ecclesiastical assumption of an exclusive right to interpret the sacred volume, as set forth in the article of the creed under consideration.

* See for an antidote to this clever, but unprincipled Popish work, “Catholic and Protestant Nations Compared,” by N. Roussell, already referred to.

2. Adulteration of the canon by the introduction of apocryphal books, which apparently afford some countenance to the doctrinal peculiarities of Popery.

3. Falsification of the text, with the view to make the Scripture conform to the doctrines of Popery, — as in “The New Testament translated by the Divines of Louvain, carefully revised and corrected by the Archbishop of Bourdeaux,” and published in that city, A.D. 1686. In this edition the Church has undertaken to “correct” the text, after a fashion of which the following are a few examples, the interpolations being in italics :—

Luke iv. 8. Him only shalt thou serve *with latría*.

Luke ii. 41. And his mother went every year *in pilgrimage* to Jerusalem.

Acts xiii. 2. As they offered to the Lord *the sacrifice of the mass* and fasted.

1 Cor. iii. 15. He himself shall be saved, yet so as by the fire of *purgatory*.

1 Cor. vii. 10. To those who are joined together in *the sacrament of marriage*, I command, &c.

1 Cor. xi. 2. Keep my commandments as I left them with you *by tradition*.

1 Tim. iv. 1. Now the Spirit expressly speaketh that some shall depart from the *Roman* faith.

1 John v. 17. There is a sin which is not *mortal* but *venial*.

4. Corruptions of the text, by the practice of false quotation. These are so common in the polemical and other treatises of the Papacy, that it is scarcely necessary to exemplify this style of Biblical policy by a reference to examples, like the following from the Council of Trent itself:—

In the “Decree (sess. 2) touching the manner of living, and other matters to be observed during the Council,” the framers of the article having occasion to refer to the passage, thus quote:—

2 Tim. iii. 2, 4. It behoveth bishops to be blameless, sober, chaste, ruling well their own households.

Thus as the Church’s practice did not agree with the apostles’ directory, that a bishop should be “the husband of one wife,” it was thought better to make the Scripture

conform to the practice of the Church, by expelling these words of the Holy Ghost from the quotation.

5. Depreciation and vilification of the Sacred Word.

“Vain is the labour” (said Hosius, the Papal legate of the Council of Trent,) “which is expended upon the Holy Scriptures, for Scripture is but a *created thing and a beggarly element*.”

The personal deliverances of the Pope himself are scarcely less complimentary to the Sacred Volume than those of his councillors, although the Pope personally has certainly more reason for the exercise of a defamatory tongue in relation to the Divine Word than any of the subordinates in his Church. The Pope hates the Bible for the same reason that Ahab hated Micaiah—it always prophesies ill of “His Holiness.” Hence what the Pope says of the Bible is but the natural effect of what the Bible says of the Pope. Let us hear some of the “great words” of the “Little Horn” on the subject of God’s book :—

Excerpt from Bull of Pius VII., 1816, against Bible Societies.

“We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device (of Bible Societies) by which the very foundations of religion are undermined. We have deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our pontifical authority in order to remedy and abolish this *pestilence* as far as possible—this defilement of the faith so imminently dangerous to the soul.”

Excerpt from Bull of Leo XII., 1824.

“It is no secret to you, venerable brethren, (the Irish clergy,) that a certain society, vulgarly called THE BIBLE SOCIETY, is audaciously bespreading itself through the world. After despising the tradition of the holy fathers, and in opposition to the well-known decree of the Council of Trent, this Society has collected all its forces, and directs every means to one object—the translation, or rather the perversion, of the Bible *into the vernacular languages of all nations*. From this fact there is strong ground to fear lest, as in some instances already known, so likewise in the rest, through a perverse interpretation, there be framed out of the gospel of Christ, a gospel of man, or what is worse, *a gospel of the Devil*.”

Excerpt from Bull of Gregory XVI., 1832.

“Hither tends that worst and never to be sufficiently execrated and detested *liberty of the press*, for the diffusion of all manner of

writings, which some so loudly contend for, and so actively promote. . . .

“No means must be omitted, says Clement XIII., our predecessor, of happy memory, in his Encyclical Letter, on the proscription of bad books; no means must be omitted here, as the extremity of the case calls for all our exertions, *to exterminate the fatal pest which spreads through so many works; nor can the materials of error be otherwise destroyed than by the flames*, which consume the depraved elements of evil. From the anxious vigilance, then, of the Holy Apostolic See, through every age, in condemning and removing from men’s minds suspected and profane books, becomes more than evident the falsity, the rashness, and the injury offered to the Apostolic See, by that doctrine pregnant with the most deplorable evils to the Christian world, advocated by some, condemning this censure of books as a needless burden, rejecting it as intolerable, or with infamous effrontery proclaiming it to be irreconcilable with the rights of men, or *denying, in fine, the right of exercising such a power, or the existence of it in the Church.*”

Excerpts from Bull of Gregory XVI., 1844.

“Among the many attempts which the enemies of Catholicism, under whatever denomination they may appear, are daily making in our age to seduce the truly faithful and deprive them of the holy instructions of the faith, the efforts of those Bible Societies are conspicuous, which, originally established in England, and propagated throughout the universe, *labour everywhere to disseminate the books of the Holy Scriptures, translated into the vulgar tongue.* . . .

“The pretended Reformers, Luther and Calvin, daring, by a multiplicity and incredible variety of errors, to attack the immutable doctrine of the faith, omitted nothing in order to seduce the faithful by their false interpretations and translations into the vernacular tongue, which the then *novel invention of printing contributed more rapidly to propagate and multiply.*

“Whence it was generally laid down in the regulations dictated by the fathers, adopted by the Council of Trent, and approved by our predecessor, Pius VII., of happy memory, and which regulations are prefixed to the Index of prohibited books, that the reading of the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, should not be permitted except to those to whom it might be deemed necessary to confirm in the faith and piety. . . .

“Consequently, even before the establishment of Bible Societies was thought of, the decrees of the Church, which we have quoted, were intended to guard the faithful against the frauds of heretics, who cloak themselves under the specious pretext *that it is necessary to propagate and render common the study of the holy books.* . . .

“Let all know, then, the enormity of the sin against God and His

Church which they are guilty of, who dare to associate themselves with any of these Societies, or abet them in any way. Moreover, we confirm and renew the decrees recited above, delivered in former times by apostolic authority *against the publication, distribution, reading, and possession of books of the Holy Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue.*"

Excerpt from Encyclical Letter of Pius IX., 1847.

"This also is the tendency and design of these insidious *Bible Societies*, which, renewing the crafts of the ancient heretics, cease not to obtrude upon all kinds of men, even the least instructed, gratuitously and at immense expense, copies in vast numbers of the books of the Sacred Scriptures, translated against the holiest rules of the Church into various vulgar tongues, and very often with the most perverse and erroneous interpretations, to the end that Divine Tradition, the doctrine of the Fathers, and the authority of the Catholic Church being rejected, every man may interpret the revelations of the Almighty according to his own private judgment; and perverting their sense, fall into the most dangerous errors; which Societies, emulous of his predecessor, Gregory XVI., of blessed memory, (to whose place we have been permitted to succeed without his merits,) reproved by his apostolic letter, *and we desire equally to condemn.*"

Thus the "hue and cry" against the Bible is taken up by Pope after Pope with unmitigated hostility to the Sacred Word, and by Pius IX., the once supposed "liberal" Pope, no less than his numerous predecessors in the chair of despotism, and who concludes his late memorable effusion with the characteristic proposition:—

"That the Roman Pontiff neither can nor ought to *reconcile himself to progress, liberalism, and moderate civilisation;*"

this proposition being the opposite of prop. 80, condemned by Pius IX.'s Encyclical of Dec. 8, 1864.

Political Relations of the Third Article of the Creed.

"I also profess, that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new law instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege; and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments."

“Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell
From heaven ; for even in heaven his looks and thoughts
Were always downward bent, admiring more
The riches of heaven’s pavement, trodden gold,
Than aught divine or holy.”—*Paradise Lost*.

There is a well-known abuse, or rather a scandalous crime, called *Simony*, from the supposed originator of this wickedness, *Simon Magus*. We may well doubt the propriety of naming this crime from that individual. The horrible sin of Simon was a desire to *purchase* the grace or gift of the Holy Ghost ; but simony, a word originating with the Papacy itself, as now understood and applied, is the *sale* of a divine favour, a crime of an opposite hue, of a deeper die, and one to which the appellation of simony is consequently totally misnomerical or inapplicable. It is evident, therefore, that the two crimes respectively referred to by Peter, “the first Pope,” and by one of the most worthy of his “successors,” Eneas Sylvius, or Pius II., in the subjoined extracts, belong to different categories of “mortal sin,” and should be distinguished by separate terms.

Acts viii. 18. And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, V. 19. Saying, Give me also this power, that on whomspever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. V. 20. But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money.

Eneas Sylvius, before he became Pope, says :—

“The court of Rome goes so far as to *sell* the imposition of hands and the gifts of the Holy Ghost.”—Epis. 66, *ad. Joan*.

Thus Simon Magus, however great a criminal, has been libelled by comparing his crime with the aggravated blasphemy of the Church which *sells* what Simon only desired to “purchase ;” and controversialists should have defended him from the vilifying comparison which has libelled his character.

And here it may be further remarked how the name of Simon Peter as well as of Simon Magus has been sacrilegiously scandalised by the Papacy. In the passage of Peter’s ministry just quoted, we see how awfully odious the

sin of receiving money for religious benefits must have appeared to the apostle. How shocked, then, would he have been, if by any presentiment he came to be informed that his "successor," the Pope, would not merely become a trafficker in the most sacred things, but would actually make use of the apostles' name to impose a tax upon universal Christendom, and call it "Peter's Pence."

The special merchandise of the Church of Rome is her sacramental traffic. Even in those States where the priest is a salaried official, the sacraments form the chief stock-in-trade of the priesthood—the priest is not satisfied to be paid for his *office*, he must also be paid for the *article* of which he is at once the manufacturer and the salesman.

A Romish sacrament is compounded of three elements—the *matter*, *form*, and the priest's *intention*, or the mental act by which he *wills* the gift or grace of the Holy Ghost into the matter and form. In the sale of the article, the purchaser has some security that he receives the matter and form, but none whatever that he receives the priest's "intention," without which the Council of Trent has decreed the sacrament to be null and void. The priest, of course, is *supposed* to sell his intention with the other two elements of the ordinance, but the distinct teaching of the Church is that he *may cheat* the buyer, and thus not only fraudulently deprive him of his cash, but of the grace of God, for which he pays the canonical price.

Lest it should be supposed that any misrepresentation is here designed, the writer subjoins a clear exposition of the teaching of the Church on the subject of sacramental intention, together with some arguments which he has already made use of in print, and which he believes cannot be successfully replied to.

Dogma of Sacramental Intention.

As already intimated, a sacrament in the Church of Rome consists of two parts—the *matter*, as the water in baptism, and the *form*, or the words by which the matter is "consecrated," or blessed and administered, as the words "I baptize thee," &c., in the sacrament of baptism, or the

words, "This is my body," in the sacrament of the Eucharist.

According to further teaching in the sacramental system of the Papacy, the matter is "effected" or so changed by the act of the priest in pronouncing the form, that it instantly becomes impregnated with the virtue or grace proper to the individual sacrament of which it is the "matter." Thus, with respect to the Eucharist, the Council of Trent decrees that—

"Immediately after the consecration (or the pronouncing of the form) the veritable body of our Lord, and His veritable blood, together with His soul and divinity, are under (or in) the species of bread and wine, . . . by *the force of the words*."—Sess. 13, chap. 3.

As the "force of the words" is that which imparts sacramental virtue to the matter, so the priest's "intention" is that which imparts the force of the words; and hence the Council further teaches—

"If any one saith that in priests, when they 'effect and confer' (or create and communicate the grace of) the sacraments there is not required the *intention*, at least, of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema (or accursed)."—Sess. 7, Canon 11.

Again we read—

"The penitent ought not so to confide in his own personal faith as to think that even though there be no contrition on his part, or no *intention on the part of the priest of acting seriously and absolving truly*, he is nevertheless truly and in God's sight absolved on account of his faith alone. For neither would faith without penance bestow any remission of sins; nor would he be otherwise than most careless of his own salvation who, knowing that a priest *but absolved him in jest*, should not carefully seek for another who would *act in earnest*."—Sess. 14, chap. 6.

Thus, not only is intention necessary, but serious and earnest intention; and while a remedy is here pointed out for a *jocular absolution*, this remedy—an application to another priest—is only available when the penitent is made aware of the invalidity of the priest's act. The actual liability of the priest to withhold intention, either by a voluntary or involuntary act, was strongly urged by the Bishop of Minori at the Council of Trent, as a reason why the Council should not make this doctrine a necessary concomitant of a sacra-

ment, and, referring in his able speech to the above idea of absolutions conferred with "no intention on the part of the priest of acting seriously and absolving truly," he stated—

"If any one say that these cases are rare, would to God that, in this corrupt age, *there were not reason to think them very frequent.*"—*Sarpi, Hist. de Conc. de Trente*, l. 2, c. 86.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent—a book next in authority to the Council of Trent itself—without entering specially on the subject of intention, shows the necessity of freedom from all such aberrations of mind as may lead to the possibility of error in pronouncing the "form." Its words are,—

"In this, the sacraments of the new law excel those of the old, that there was no definite form known to us of administering those of the old, a circumstance which rendered them uncertain and obscure, whilst in those of the new the form is so definite, *that any, even a casual deviation from it, renders the sacrament null.*"—*Donovan's Roman Catholic Ed. of 1829*, p. 146.

Thus, if the priest, through want not merely of right conscientious intention, but through the slightest temporary absence of its exercise, should happen to introduce a wrong word, or omit the prescribed one in the form, or perhaps even to vocalise some syllable contrary to the rules of quantity, the sacrament administered, instead of being a vehicle of grace, is but an empty form,—a possible miscarriage which leaves no room for the assertion that "the sacraments of the new law excel in certainty those of the old."

The theology of intention, however, is only to be fully understood by a reference to the *Missale Romanum*, from which the following teaching is extracted :—

"If any priest does not intend to make (the sacrament), but to do something *deceitfully* . . . he does not consecrate, inasmuch as *intention is necessary.*"—*Roman Missal*, "On the defects (or fallibilities) of the Mass."

Again, in order to illustrate this doctrine, the *Missal* says,—

"If any priest have before him eleven wafers, and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining which ten . . . he does not consecrate, inasmuch as intention is necessary,"

that is, to determine not only the exact number, but the exact individual wafers to be consecrated.

Again, illustrating the doctrine by the case of the Eucharist, it is added,—

“A defect may occur on the part of the matter to be consecrated, or that of the form to be applied, and on that of the priest celebrating; and, if there be a defect in any of these—namely, the due matter with *intention*, and the priestly rule in celebrating, *no sacrament is made.*”

“Intention,” says Dens, the celebrated Roman Catholic doctor, canonist, and casuist, “is the act of the *will*, referring to an end;” or, to express the same thing in a less metaphysical or more popular phrase, “the act of the mind, which *wills some effect to follow.*” Individual priests like Dens have endeavoured to qualify the signification of the term in order to escape from some of the consequences of the doctrine, but individual priests are individually fallible; and therefore, until another infallible Council agree to give another infallible decision upon the doctrine, we must abide by the Council of Trent, and take the words of the Council *as the Missal takes them.* From the Council and Missal, then, we deduce the following :—

That virtue or grace is put into a sacrament by means of “the force or power of the words” in consecration, and that the words derive this force or power from the priest’s intention or will. Thus, if the priest intends or wills it, the words pronounced in baptising a child have force or power to regenerate the child; and if the priest does not so intend or will it, the words, and consequently the water, have no power to regenerate the child, “inasmuch as intention is necessary.” Again, if the priest intends or wills it, his words can transubstantiate or make a wafer into Christ and, if he does not intend or will to transubstantiate, his words alone possess no power to change the wafer into Christ, “inasmuch as intention is necessary.”

That, in professing to “effect and confer” the grace of a sacrament, the priest *may not* have the necessary intention, is shown by the Missal when it says, “A defect (or omission) MAY OCCUR in the priest’s intention.” And again,

when it says, "If the priest does not intend to make the sacrament, but to do something *deceitfully*," which shows that he may intend to "do something deceitfully," and *not* "to make the sacrament."

That "defects" of intention *do occur* is also certain ; for priests are but men, and therefore subject to the infirmities and sins which must at times cause such defects ; *otherwise there would be no occasion for the Council to make the rule of intention at all*. Thus, a priest may be an inward unbeliever in what the Church teaches—a case avowed by many priests, as Blanco White, who have left the Church of Rome, and confessed their unbelief in the teaching of the Church for years before. Now, a priest who is thus an infidel in reference to the teaching of the Church, cannot "intend to do what the Church does" when he consecrates verbally ; for the Church declares she can "effect and confer," or create and communicate the grace of a sacrament, but an infidel priest believes she cannot ; therefore, such a priest cannot intend to do what the Church does, for *no one can intend to do what he believes cannot be done*.

As therefore a sacrament in the Church of Rome is made by "intention," or cannot be made without it, and as according to the confession of the Church, a defect of intention "may occur," and according to the confession of priests (like Blanco White) such defects *do occur*, it follows that no Roman Catholic can tell whether he has received the grace of a sacrament unless he first know whether the priest has had the "intention" requisite in the act of consecration.

Now, what the priest's intention is in the act of consecration can only be known either because he declares he has had the right intention, or because we can see the right intention in the mind of the priest ; but we cannot know the priest's intention by any declaration on his part, for God only can tell whether the priest in any particular case declares what is true, and the Missal itself admits he may "act deceitfully," therefore we cannot know the priest's intention by his profession or declaration. Again, we cannot of course know the priest's intention by any exercise of sight or vision ; for no one can see the act of another indi-

vidual's mind: and to make the reasoning on this point wholly conclusive with Roman Catholics, here is Cardinal Bellarmine's testimony in the case,—

“No one can be certain with the certainty of faith that he has received a true sacrament, since the sacrament is not formed without the intention of the minister, *and no one can see the intention of another.*”—Tom. i. p. 488, Prag. 1721.

Consequences flowing from the Doctrine of Intention.

Such being the theology of Intention, in reference to the sacramental system in general, let us now notice some of the consequences of the doctrine in the use of one or two of the sacraments.

Thus as “Orders” is a sacrament requiring right intention to administer it, the bishop who ordains a priest must have had the right intention, else the priest ordained is no true priest, and the bishop ordaining could be no true bishop, unless he was ordained with right intention by the previous bishop, and the latter again could be no true bishop unless ordained with right intention by his predecessor; and so on up to the apostles themselves. Now granting that we could know, or at least be satisfied of, the right intention of any individual priest from whom we received a sacrament; yet, in order to know that he is a true priest, and consequently that he has “effected and conferred” the grace of some particular sacrament, we must know the right intention of all the bishops through whom his ordination has come—that is, *we must know one impossibility multiplied by an innumerable series of others.*

Again, to enhance the difficulties of the case, as Baptism is a sacrament which therefore requires to be administered with right intention, no priest can be such, or can “effect and confer” the grace of a sacrament unless he has been baptised with this intention. Hence, in order to know whether any professing priest is a priest, we must not only be sure that he has received ordination, but also *baptism*, with a series of right intentions in the line of administrators up to the apostolic baptisers—a *requirement which doubles the last product of multiplied impossibilities.*

Again, as ordination is that which makes the recipient a *visible member* of the priesthood, and baptism that which makes the recipient a *visible member* of the Church ; and as no priest can prove himself ordained with right intention, and therefore ordained at all ; and further, as no Roman Catholic can prove himself baptised with right intention, and therefore baptised at all,—it follows that no priest is a visible member of the priesthood, and no Roman Catholic a visible member of his Church, and that the Church of Rome, which professes to be the only visible church on earth, *is the only church on earth invisible !*

Once more, to refer to the suicidal and self-damning teaching of the Church in this extraordinary doctrine, the Catechism of the Council of Trent tells us that the sacraments are “interiorly dispensed by Christ,” and that the invisible “priest (in the Mass) is also the same Christ our Lord.”—*Donovan's Roman Catholic Ed. of 1829*, pp. 149, 249.

If Christ is the interior priest in the Mass, then of course HE *has always* the right intention, for *He* cannot be either remiss or deceitful. If Christ has always right intention, then when the human priest has not, either the sacrifice of the mass is efficacious or it is not. If it is efficacious, then the virtue of the sacrifice does not depend upon the will of the human priest, and the doctrine of intention is false ; if it is not efficacious, then the priestly will of Christ is frustrated by the neglect or deceit of the human priest, which is a supposition as absurd as it is profane.

Political Relations of the Doctrine of Intention.

What induced the Pope to broach this doctrine ?

Ans. To exalt himself above all that is called God, (2 Thes. ii. 4.) In other churches, as the Church of England, the civil law or magistrate can compel the minister to dispense the sacraments or appoint others who will ; so that if the people should happen to displease the minister, he cannot retaliate or revenge himself by “withholding the rites of the Church.” In order, therefore, to place his priest

above the law, or above the civil magistrate—who, as we have seen, is called a god in Scripture—the Pope, (or Satan speaking by his ambassador,) devised the doctrine of intention, by which he made the human validity of a sacrament depend upon an act of the mind which cannot be known, and therefore the exercise of which cannot be compelled, and the neglect of which cannot be punished by civil authority. But God “taketh the wise in their own craftiness ;” for that which made the validity of a sacrament unknown to the magistrate *made it equally so to the people* ; so that the same policy which deprived the magistrate of the knowledge necessary to enforce the priest’s duty, deprived the people of the knowledge necessary for their salvation.

Hence the doctrine of intention has come to be shied as much as possible by the latter-day defenders of the Papacy ; and in using the sacraments with a political aim, the Papacy, instead of depending upon any influence connected with the professed power of the priest’s intention—a power which Roman Catholics themselves are evidently beginning to disregard—now adopts the policy of *withholding the sacraments altogether*. A prominent illustration of this policy occurred in the early part of the political disruption which has occurred at the present day between Sardinia and the Papacy. This disruption was originally occasioned by a series of reforms entered upon by the Government of Sardinia, and, as a matter of course, opposed by the policy of the Vatican. The Pope, like his brother potentate of China, is fond of the *statu quo*, and an enemy of all progress except that which characterises the locomotive progression of the crab. Hence Sardinia being desirous to move on, and the Papacy to move backwards, the two states came to a political rupture, the crisis of which was occasioned by the celebrated Siccardi Law. On the 25th of February 1850 Count Siccardi introduced, and subsequently carried, in the Italian Parliament the well-known legal measure for the abolishment of those ecclesiastical immunities which the Papacy had so long imposed upon the kingdom of Piedmont. In criminal and civil

causes the priests were henceforth made subject to the jurisdiction of the general law courts ; what was designated the right of asylum and other abuses were similarly abolished in spite of the most vehement protests and opposition of the Papal Government. Hounded on by Antonelli, the Archbishop of Turin, as well as the Archbishop of Siccari, in the island of Sardinia, resisted the Siccardi statute. Both these leading ecclesiastical rebels, with many of their followers, were accordingly tried, convicted, and righteously condemned to the endurance of the statutory penalties which vindicated the rightful supremacy of the state over these lawless churchmen.

The Pope, being no longer able to command the service of the "secular arm" and the "temporal sword," next proceeded to unsheathe his spiritual weapon. The first victim, and the only one whose case we have room to notice was Count Santa Rosa, the agricultural and commercial minister of the Sardinian Government. As a minister of the state, he had been influential in carrying the Siccardi Law, and shortly after was attacked with what proved to be a fatal illness. Before administering the last rites of the Church the curate of his parish was instructed to demand from him a recantation of his opinions in reference to the law which he had helped to carry ; but this he refused. The archbishop was appealed to, but was not to be moved from his purpose to let Rosa "die and be damned" if he did not change his political opinions. The Church, however, failed to extort the required recantation ; the sacraments were consequently uncommunicated ; and as Rome pursues her victim after death, the usual rites of sepulture were also withheld, and Santa Rosa, as the saying is, was "buried with the burial of an ass!"

Romish Baptism.

Baptism is the great instrument which Popery employs to evangelise or (using the liberty to coin a word which seems to be wanted) to Romangelise the world. But apart from its import in a strictly religious sphere, this Romish rite involves temporal and social interests of the first im-

portance in the political relations of Popery. With the appointments and ministrations of this ordinance the Papacy associates the Pope's right to the exercise of a temporal control not only over the souls but over the bodies of the baptised, and not only over those baptised within the pale and by the ministerial officials of his own Church, but over the baptised of all churches and all ministers. The association of such temporal powers with the ordinance of Baptism, therefore, establishes *the Pope's claim to that temporal supremacy* which is so often denied by some Roman Catholics of the present day. But if it can be shown that the baptismal prerogatives which he assumes includes the right to exercise a control over the personal liberty, as well as religious belief, of the subjects of this ordinance, then his assumption of temporal supremacy can be no longer disputed ; and it does not appear that the Protestant controversialist has sufficiently, if at all, noticed this foundation for the proof of a much disputed point in the Romish controversy. In examining the teaching of Rome on this subject, the first proposition to be noticed is

Popish Homologation of Heretical Baptism.

"If any one saith that baptism which is given *even by heretics* in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church does, is not true baptism, let him be anathema" (or accursed.)—*Council of Trent*, Sess. 7, on Baptism, canon 4.

The same doctrine is taught by the Catechism of the Council in the following words :—

"Those who may administer baptism, in case of necessity, but without its solemn ceremonies, hold the third and last place, (as administrators of baptism;) and in this class are included all, even the laity, men and women, to whatever sect they may belong. This power extends, in case of necessity, even to Jews, infidels, and heretics, provided, however, they intend to do what the Catholic Church does in that act of her ministry."—*Donovan's Ed.*, pp. 167, 168.

The marvellous condescension of Popery in thus extending the right of baptism to all appears a theological anomaly until the further teaching of the Church develops the sinister motive of this apparent liberality but real

tyranny—namely, the motive of subjecting “heretics” to the

Popish Obligations of Heretical Baptism.*

“If any one saith that the baptised are freed from all the precepts, whether written or transmitted, of Holy Church, in such wise that they are not bound to observe them unless they have chosen of their own accord to submit themselves thereunto, let him be anathema or accursed.”—*Ibid.*, canon 8.

Thus Rome extends the benefits of baptism and the power to baptise to all, that she may compass the slavery of all, or make this ordinance the means of imposing her religious creed upon all—a creed which the Church imposes not merely by the moral, but by the

Penal Obligations of Heretical Baptism.

“If any one saith, that those who have been thus baptised when children are, when they have grown up, to be asked whether they will ratify what their sponsors promised in their names when they were baptised, and that in case they answer that they will not, they *are to be left to their own will, and are not to be compelled meanwhile to a Christian life by any other penalty*, save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist and of the other sacraments until they repent, let him be anathema.”—*Ibid.*, canon 14.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent vindicates the same doctrine.

Again Dens’ *Theology*—a work read in most Roman Catholic colleges in Ireland—treats the question of the compulsory subjection of heretics, &c., to the Church in the following terms :—

“Baptised infidels, as heretics and apostates are wont to be, also baptised schismatics, can be *compelled even by corporal punishments* to return to the Catholic faith and the unity of the Church.

“The reason is, that by baptism they have been made the subjects of the Church, and therefore the Church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of *compelling them by the appointed* means to obedience.”

This also (he says) holds good with respect to those who have been baptised in their infancy, or who, whether com-

* Heretical baptism will equally apply to the baptism of heretics or by heretics,

pelled through fear or any other necessity, have received baptism, as the Council of Trent teaches, Sess. VII., can. 14, and the Fourth Council of Toledo, can. 55.

“It is objected, no one believes unless he is willing; but the will cannot be compelled, therefore no person can be compelled to the faith.

“It is answered by denying the consequent—(viz., that the will cannot be compelled)—for he is not compelled that he should believe against his will, but from being unwilling he should be made willing.

“You will urge—No one can be compelled to baptism; therefore no one can be compelled to the faith.

“We answer with St Thomas here, Ad. 3, ‘As to vow is the part of the will, but to pay what you have vowed, of necessity; so to receive the faith is the part of the will, but to hold it when received, of necessity;’ and so heretics can be compelled to hold the faith.”

“Meanwhile,” (adds Dens,) “it is not always expedient that the Church should exercise this right, as will appear from what shall be said hereafter.”—Vol. ii. pp. 79-81.

The meaning of this last direction to “be given hereafter,” is simply that the Church is to enforce obedience to the Pope when she is able, and to allow the heretic to retain his freedom when she has no power to compel his obedience agreeably to the old mediæval doggerel—

When the heretic is weak, let the Church use the rod,
When the heretic is strong, leave him to God.

Again, Dens’ *Theology* further explains the doctrine of Popish baptism, in relation to non-members or non-professors of Popery, in these terms:—

“Heretics, schismatics, apostates, and all such like, being baptised, are bound by the laws of the church which concern them, because they have been by baptism made subjects of the Church; nor are they more released from her laws than subjects rebelling against a lawful prince are released from the laws of that prince.

“To this it is objected—Heretics are not in the Church, therefore they are not subjects of the Church.”

In reply to this objection, Dens draws a very clear line of distinction between heretical communion with, and heretical subjection to, the Church, in these words—

“We answer by distinguishing the antecedent—Heretics, as far as union of charity and the communion of saints,—here the antecedent is granted.

"But they are not in the Church as to subjection,—here the antecedent is denied, for they *have been made by baptism subjects of the Church, and they remain personally subject to the Church wherever they may be.*"—Dens, vol. ii. p. 289.

Again, Delahogue, in his "Dogmatic Theology," another Maynooth class-book, thus defines—

"The Church *retains her jurisdiction over all apostates, heretics, and schismatics*, although they do not now belong to her body, as the general of an army has a right of decreeing the severer punishments against a deserter who has been erased from his muster-roll."—*De Ecclesia*, p. 394.

Once more, Bailly's "Moral Theology," another Maynooth class-book, defines—

"Heretics are bound by the laws of the Church, because they are by baptism made subjects of the Church; nor are they more exempted from her laws than subjects who rebel against a prince."—Tom. i. p. 179.

Rome is not satisfied to make the baptised submit to her doctrine and authority, but to make the unbaptised submit to her baptism. This is the

Romish Doctrine of Compulsory Baptism.

Pope Innocent III., defining on this subject, says—

"He who is *violently attracted by terrors and punishments, and lest he should incur loss*, receives the sacrament of baptism, such a one (as also he who feignedly approaches the font) receives the character, the impress of Christianity, and being, as it were, conditionally willing, although not absolutely, is to be forced to the observance of the Christian faith. In which sense," continues the Pope, "ought to be understood the decree of the Fourth Council of Toledo, in the canon concerning the Jews, where it is said—'But those who are forced to come over to Christianity it is necessary that they should be obliged by compulsion or necessity to retain the faith which they have received, lest the name of God be blasphemed, and the faith which they profess become esteemed vile and contemptible.' . . . Hence St Thomas Aquinas saith — But if this compulsion from threats and stripes is such that the baptised *would rather choose baptism than suffer such things*, then he receives the sacrament, but not the advantages of the sacrament :"

That is, he receives the sacrament as to its obligations, but not as to its benefits.

The Roman Catholic Ferraris, referring to the above testimony of Innocent III., adds—

“Nay, for validly receiving baptism, any voluntary consent is sufficient, although it is mixed with an involuntary one, *extorted by force or fear of any kind*.”—Ferraris, *Baptismus*, art. v., sec. 30, “*Encyclop. Eccles.*,” Francof, 1781.

The imposition of Romish baptism, either by forcible, surreptitious, or fraudulent means, has been carried on extensively by the Church of Rome both at home and abroad, and has not long ago met with a serious reproof from the public voice of Europe, in the case of the Mortara child who was thus baptised, and afterwards forcibly wrested by the Pope from the child’s parents, under the following circumstances:—“Salomon Mortara was a Jew, residing at Bologna in 1857, and had a Roman Catholic servant named Anna Morisi. His son, Edgar Mortara, was baptised surreptitiously some years before by this Anna; the child being sick at the time. In November of the above year, a woman, named Marianna Bajesi, gave information to the Inquisitor of Bologna about the transaction, and the Inquisitor having examined Anna Morisi, and found the information confirmed by her statements, immediately sent police to the house of Mortara, who took forcible possession of the child and sent him to Rome, where the Pope retained him as an ecclesiastical subject, according to the rule of Benedict XIV., which is thus expressed—

“Cum filius Hebræorum consignatus fuisset nutrici Christianæ, in deficientia nutricum Hebræorum, dum esset proximus morti fuit baptizatus et sacra congregatio declaravit prædictum puerum fuisse licite baptizatum.”

“When a son of Hebrew parents has been delivered to the care of a Christian nurse, (and) while near death was baptised by the nurse in the absence of the Hebrew parents, and the Holy Congregation has declared its decision, the boy has been lawfully baptised.”

The *Tablet* newspaper, of the 6th November 1858, in attempting to defend this piece of baptismal legislation, says—

“We owe an apology to our subscribers for troubling them again with the ‘affair Mortara,’ which is a plain question of the Catechism requiring no learning for its solution—only a little grace to receive it as it ought to be received; but, unfortunately, that little grace is wanting to the furious infidels, who create the disturbance and

darken a question clear as the sun at noon. The child Mortara has acquired rights which no human power can take away; but by violence, and for the loss of which no government can ever make compensation. The act which made him a Christian is irrevocable, beyond the powers of any human tribunal to annul, and *by that act he became as a dead child to his Hebrew father*, (so far as the authority of the latter over his religion was concerned,) as completely as if he had died a natural death. *Neither he nor his parents, it is true, consented to the deed*; but that absence of consent cannot vitiate it, because the act of baptism once validly complete, remains for ever indelible, whatever may be his education or the future habits of his life."

Thus this practical case, (and practice is the best expositor of doctrine,) puts the doctrine of compulsory, or what may be called political baptism, in a light, as the *Tablet* says, clear as the sun at noon. The revelation made by this light is, that Popery claims the power to enforce the rite of baptism and its obligations upon all, and that after the administration of the ordinance, by stealth or force, the Pope, in common with the inhabitants of the Confederate States of America, claims to possess the prerogative of man-stealing. There is, however, this difference in the case, that while the Confederate man-stealer confines his privilege to the "cursed" children of Ham, the Pope extends his claim to the children of Shem and Japhet; and the following is the consolation given for the outrage, in the further apologetic lucubration of the *Tablet*:—

"As to the act of baptism and the absence of parental consent, that is easily disposed of, like all other irrevocable acts to which human life is liable. So far as the Jews are concerned, it is an accident which they could not prevent. They lost their child by baptism as they might have lost it by fire or sudden death. Every family is exposed to some danger or other in rearing their infants; nurses may be *careless, and thereby occasion mutilation, loss of life, or broken limbs*. The matter is irrevocable, and people must endure what they were unable to prevent.

"It may be hard upon individuals that they should suffer, without remedy, the consequence of a single act to which they were not parties at all, still less consenting parties. But such is the condition of human life, we are all liable to losses from the acts of others, and cannot protect ourselves;"

That is, where or when the Pope has power to execute his temporal will upon the subjects of a forcibly or clandestinely administered baptism.

The baptismal principles homologated by the *Tablet* in the foregoing explanations are—

1. That the children of Jews, Protestants, or other “furious infidels,” may be forcibly or stealthily baptised in “the absence of parental consent.”

2. That by such baptism the child “has acquired rights which no human power can take away”—these rights being, according to the Council of Trent, the right to believe all that Popery teaches, “whether written or transmitted,” and the right to remain a Papist for life, or “be compelled even by corporal punishments to return to the Catholic faith and the unity of the Church.”—Dens, *On the Council of Trent*, sess. 7, canon 14, on baptism.

3. That by such baptism the subject of it “becomes as a dead child” to the religious authority of parents.

4. That when the agents of the Papacy thus succeed, “in the absence of the parents’ consent,” to administer forcible or clandestine baptism, and the child in consequence becomes the subject of abduction by the Pope’s police, the parents are to be reconciled to it as “an accident which they could not prevent”—they “lost their child by baptism, as they might have lost it by fire or sudden death;” that is, we suppose, “the fire or sudden death” which, according to St Thomas, the Pope has as much right to administer to heretics as he has baptism by water.—Dens’ *Theology*, tom. ii., p. 89.

Thus, according to the most distinct avowals of popular as well as prelatie teaching in the Church of Rome, the Pope has a right to baptise whom he can *nolens volens*, and afterwards to compel the baptised to receive his teaching and submit to his authority by obligations, which, as the *Tablet* says, “no human power can take away,” and which the Pope can enforce by any “corporal punishments” he may choose to apply. The doctrine, therefore, necessarily includes the Pope’s authority over the temporal liberty of children and the civil rights of parents, and, as we have said, establishes beyond all dispute the claim of the Pope’s supremacy in temporals. The case further proves, that the Pope’s temporal kingdom, laws, police, and jails constitute a

political machinery for the robbery of parents and the enslavement of their offspring after the fashion described and defended by the heartless miscreant who penned the preceding specimens of Job's comfort for the unhappy parents and children, who may be thus mutually despoiled of property in each other, by the "Vicar of Christ."

Popish baptism further includes the

Political Relations of the Sponsorial System of the Papacy.

Baptism requires the deputy officials called sponsors, or godfathers and godmothers, and the system in Popery creates what is called "spiritual affinity" between these, as well as between lay baptisers and the baptised. By this created spiritual affinity the parties related can never contract marriage, however suitable in other respects.

"The Church, therefore, in her wisdom, has ordained that not only the person who baptises contracts a spiritual affinity with the person baptised, but also the sponsors with the god-child and its parents; so that marriage cannot be lawfully contracted by them; and if contracted, it is null and void."—*Cat. Council of Trent*, p. 170.

The system, therefore, introduces a matrimonial hindrance, never intended by God, and is one of the many modes by which Popery fulfils the prophetic mark—forbidding to marry. Parties, however, thus restricted from marriage by an artificial affinity may be *dispensed* from the restriction by the same power which created it. The dispensation, of course, requires money, and thus the Pope drives a trade by first *gratuitously* creating what he calls "impediments to marriage," and then imposing a tax for their removal!

It is evident that an artificial impediment to marriage of this kind, not warranted by any natural law, and therefore properly ignored by civil law, must create collisions with the State on the subject of marriage,—collisions calculated to disturb social relations by infringement of rights, over which the Pope has no control, except what he has contrived to derive by associating the most tyrannical temporal claims with a purely religious ordinance.

The Church of Rome rejects from her system of salvation the plan of justification by faith in Jesus Christ. She regards justification as a gift to be communicated and received only through a sacramental channel ; and the two sacraments to which she confines the application and reception of the gift are Baptism and Penance. Hence, in discussing the principles of Romanism, these two sacraments, having a common reference, and a consequent mutual relationship to the same spiritual end, are advantageously considered consecutively. That is, Penance is best reviewed after Baptism, and not in the order of the Creed, where it succeeds the Eucharist. The arrangement of the Creed is also contrary to the sacramental administration of the Church herself ; for, practically, Penance always *precedes* the Eucharist, and is, in fact, the Romish preparation for the reception of the Lord's Supper. The Scripture says, " Let a man *examine himself*, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup ;" but Popery says, " Let a priest examine a man, (*i.e.*, in the ordeal of confession,) and so let him eat," &c.

The justification of Penance and Baptism are, however, distinct as to their character and results. Baptism justifies from *all* sin; Penance from *mortal* sin only. This distinction of sin into Mortal and Venial is not merely of theological interest, but involves temporal consequences of much importance in the social system. Hence, in the political, as in the sacramental consideration of Penance, the first subject of inquiry is the doctrine of

Mortal and Venial Sin.

As Popery makes that to be sin which God makes to be no sin, so it declares that to be no sin which God declares to be damning sin. Thus the Pope decrees it to be a mortal sin to eat meat on a Friday, but he makes it no sin to steal the meat ; while God makes it no sin to eat the meat, but a mortal sin to steal it. Of course Popery, in treating of the theft of a dinner, calls it a " Venial Sin ;" but it is easy to prove that what Popery calls Venial Sin is either no sin or damnable sin. Here is the proof :—

“Sin is the transgression of the law,” 1 John iii. 4;

“The wages of sin is death,” Romans vi. 23;

therefore, the wages of every transgression of the law is death.

Now “Venial Sin” is either a transgression of the law, or it is not. If it is a transgression of the law, then its wages is death; and the sentence being mortal, the sin is mortal. If it is not a transgression of the law, then it is *no sin*, much less Venial Sin.

According to Romish teaching Venial Sin is confessedly a transgression of the law; but so slight a violation of some Divine precept, that it does not incur God’s judicial anger. It is a *little* sin—a diminutive trespass on the margin or forbidden boundary of the law, which does so little harm as not to forfeit the Divine favour. It is no use to tell the Romanist what God declares on the subject by such passages as—

Luke xvi. 10—He that is faithful in that which is *least* is faithful also in *much*; and he that is unjust in the *least* is unjust also in *much*.

This, he says, is Protestant doctrine, derived from the Bible explained by private judgment. The Word of God explained by tradition puts another meaning on the passage, viz., that what the Bible *means* upon this subject is just the reverse of what it *says*.

However this may be, the civil magistrate who rightly uses his prerogative, who thinks it wise to make the Bible the ultimate statute-book of the State, and who, for this purpose, claims the prerogative to interpret the book as well as the priest, is frequently obliged to deal with scriptural sin in the character of social crime; and some of those venial offences which, in the priest’s estimation, need no penance, the magistrate has often to visit with the penance of a protracted imprisonment, transportation, and, in former times, even with hanging itself.

“Venial Sin,” therefore,—such as “venial” robbery, or “venial” falsehood,—is a doctrine of no small importance in a political aspect, as it exposes society to a class of privileged criminals, vitiates the civil morality of the Roman

Catholic subject, and brings the moral law of the Papacy into collision with the civil law of the State in nearly as many ways as there are forms of Venial Sin.

It is not here necessary to refer to all the forms of "venial" delinquency by which Popish and civil morality are thus brought into mutual conflict. The social and civil bearings of Popish morality may be sufficiently exemplified by a reference to one or two of the Church's text-books, and one or two forms of those criminal offences which she disposes Roman Catholics to commit by the palliating doctrine and title of Venial Sin.

Bailly on the Sin of "Venial" Theft.

Bailly is one of the most approved of the theological and moral text-books employed in St Patrick's College, or the college better known as Maynooth College.

The distinction between Mortal and Venial Sin having come in course for examination in his "Theologica Dogmatica et Moralis," he asks, in relation to breaches of the 7th (Protestant division 8th) commandment—

"How great must be the quantity of the thing stolen in order to constitute the theft a *mortal* sin?"

"Answer: The quantity cannot be easily determined, since nothing has been *decided on the point*, either in natural, divine, or human law. Some are of opinion that the quantity necessary for the maintenance of an individual for *one day* in a manner suitable to his station in the world is sufficient to make the theft a mortal sin. Others think that it requires a quantity which, everything considered, inflicts a *grievous injury* on our neighbour, and deprives him of something *particularly* useful. A loss, however, which, in respect of one, a rich man, for instance, is slight—in respect of a poor man may be considered heavy. The same quantity cannot, therefore, be assigned as constituting the subject-matter of mortal sin.

"Hence theologians are accustomed to distinguish men into four ranks. The *first* rank consists of the illustrious, who live in splendour. The *second*, of those who live on their own estates, but not so splendidly—such as are moderately rich. The *third*, of artificers, who support themselves by their own labour and handicraft. The *fourth*, of the poor, who provide for themselves by begging. It is generally laid down, and it may be laid down as determined, that, in order to a theft's being a mortal sin when committed on persons of the first rank, *fifty or sixty pence* are sufficient. In fact this

appears to be a sufficient sum with reference to *all* men, even princes; because this sum of money is considerable in itself, and might be of service to princes, since it would be sufficient for the pay of several soldiers for one day. With respect to persons of the second rank, if their trade be a very lucrative one, *twenty pence*; if less lucrative, *ten pence*. With respect to persons of the fourth rank, —that is, paupers,—*four pence*, or even *one penny*, if they have nothing else to live upon.

“But there is no one who does not perceive that the division mentioned above is very inadequate. How great a difference is there among artificers? How many live on their own estates who are more straitened than some merchants, to whom a theft of the same sum would be a greater loss than to merchants who are richer than they? Hence we do not give the aforesaid rule as a thing on which you can rely with certainty; but *it is good, as being something to guide confessors*, taking all circumstances prudently into consideration.” — *Bailly's Moral Theology*, vol. ii. p. 232. Treatise on the Precepts of the Decalogue.

These instructions for venial robbery in general are supplemented by other directions for special cases, such as the following, which is the seventh question discussed on the subject of theft:—

“Whether wives commit a mortal sin of theft if, contrary to the reasonable wishes of their husbands, they secretly take anything *considerable* from the property which is under the power of their husbands?

“It is answered, that they commit a mortal sin of theft, because that they greatly injure the just right of the husband. But *what quantity ought to be accounted considerable* in these thefts cannot easily be determined.”—*Ibid.*, p. 238.

Servants in the employment of masters are similarly instructed:—

“That they sin mortally if they pilfer a *considerable* quantity; venially if a small quantity.”—*Ibid.*, pp. 239, 240.

Venial Sin as Expounded in the Romish Work called “What every Christian must Know.”*

This small work was published and circulated in Dublin

* A second edition of this work bears the improved title of “What every Christian must Know and Do.” Furniss avouches that the teaching of his work is derived from the moral theology of St Liguori, the present canonised guide of the Church. See for a damaging exposure of this work, the “Catholic Layman,” vol. vi. p. 1, *et passim*.

(Duffy, 1856) by Priest Furniss, one of the Roman Catholic missionaries called "Redemptorist Fathers," and is an attempt to popularise and disseminate the style of Romish morality taught in the more elaborate text-books of Bailly and others. The work is a summary of instruction on confession and its concomitants, including an exposition and comments upon the Decalogue.

Omitting any reference to the most immoral teaching of this work on the several commandments up to the 7th (Protestant 8th) precept of the Decalogue, or that which has been chosen to illustrate Bailly—the same morality, on the same subject of honesty, is thus taught by the Redemptorist Father :—

"It is a venial sin to steal a *little*. It is a mortal sin to steal *much*; for instance, to steal from a workman a day's wages, or to steal less from a poorer man, or more from a richer man.

"If you steal from different persons, it needs half as much again for a mortal sin, and the same if you steal at different times.

"If you steal from different persons, as well as at different times, it needs double the sum.

"If you steal often a little, when the little sum comes to make a large sum, then it becomes a mortal sin."

Here we have, at least, one answer to the hitherto supposed unanswerable question in the science of Romish casuistry—"How many venial sins go to make a mortal?" *Ans.*—in the department of roguery—As many "littles" as make "a muckle."

"It is also a mortal sin to steal a little if, at the same time, you have the will and intention to steal much if you could."—P. 20.

These expositions with respect to Bailly's rules, which he says form a "good guide" on the subject of venial stealing, show that his instructions have not been lost, and that the scholar has even in some respects improved upon the counsel of his master. Bailly says that not more than "twenty pence" can be stolen from a tradesman without incurring the guilt of mortal sin. Furniss allows the thief to take any sum short of "a day's wages," and in this case considerably extends the liberty of robbery within the limits of venial sin. Thus, should a tradesman be earning five shillings a day—a pretty common wage—Furniss teaches

that a Romanist may rob the artisan of four and elevenpence halfpenny without committing a mortal sin by the act. If the venial sinner should be fortunate enough to be able to steal from two tradesmen instead of one, he may steal "half as much again"—that is, four and elevenpence halfpenny, plus two and fivepence farthing, or within a farthing of seven and sixpence ; and again, if he steals from the same two persons at "different times," it needs double the sum to make a mortal sinner of the thief—that is, in the example given, it requires a robbery of ten shillings to make a mortal sin ; so that, taking a very common wage as the basis of the calculation, any Roman Catholic may steal nine and elevenpence three farthings from any two honest men, and still be only a venial rogue—an honest member of his Church !

Several more forms of venial robbery are contained in "What every Christian must Know;" or, as later editions of the book are entitled, "What every Christian must Know *and Do*."

"When materials are given for some work,—for example, cloth to tailors,—it is a sin to keep pieces which remain, *except* people are quite sure that it is not against the will of the employer ; or *it is necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit*."—P. 21.

How much is necessary to constitute a reasonable profit, of course, is to be decided, not according to the judgment of the employer, but of the thief. Thus, while "private judgment" in doctrine is always a mortal sin, private judgment in practical morality—private judgment, for example, as to what amount of dishonesty or falsehood will constitute a Romanist a thief or a liar, is largely allowed to the members of the priest's flock !

Restitution is thus treated :—

"You may delay restitution, if you cannot do it at present without very great difficulty ; for example, if a workman would have to sell his tools, or if a person would lose his character. But you must have the will and intention to do it as soon as possible, at least by little and little."—P. 22.

"Agree with thine adversary *quickly*" is not the rule here. The Bible, explained by tradition and Father Furniss,

says, "Let your own, not his convenience, be the rule of agreement with the party injured in person, property, or character."

Touching this same subject of character, the Furniss morality says :—

"If you injure *much*, or take away any one's character by a lie, it is a mortal sin, and you must recall the lie. *You might say you were mistaken, or the like.*"—P. 23.

That is, when you have *wilfully* lied against an individual or his character, you "might" employ a second lie to excuse the first.

Again, as a specimen of the Furniss doctrine on the subject of secrets, we read :—

"Telling a secret is wrong, and is very bad if it is a *great* secret, and telling it does great harm, and gives much sorrow. It would not be wrong to tell it for a *good reason*, such as to ask advice."—P. 23.

This is a sample of the Jesuit applied to a particular case : "You may do evil that good may come." You may betray any secret, however great, for a "good reason"—the good reason being, in all probability, one which the betrayer thinks good for himself.

We have here private judgment in the practice of sinning freely allowed, as well as in the following instructions :—

"To read letters or private papers is wrong, and would be very bad if *you think* perhaps there is something in them the owner would be very sorry for you to know."—P. 24.

The directory here, of course, all depends upon what a violator of secrecy may happen to "think ;" the likelihood being that the wish here, as in other cases, will be "father to the thought ;" and that when a curious or knavish speculator *wishes* to benefit by forbidden information, he will *think* there is nothing in any document he may examine which "the owner would be very sorry for him to know."

Such are specimens of "what every Christian must know." Every Christian must know how to steal, lie, and violate the whole decalogue, within the limits of Venial Sin ; the limits being either so extensive or undefined that any Romanist may become a depredator equal to "a ticket-of-leave man"

without contracting the degree of criminality called Mortal Sin. As many Protestants are worse than their creed, it is fortunate that many Roman Catholics are better than theirs. Numbers of Romanists, however, doubtless avail themselves of the liberty to perpetrate the robbery, falsehood, and other crimes permitted, or rather advocated, by Bailly, Furniss, & Co., under the name of Venial Sin.

It is evident that Romanists who are thus identified with the teaching of their Church, must be at variance, both in opinion and practice, with the civil morality of at least all Protestant States. Regarding the Church as a higher guide than the State, he will infer that what is accounted only a Venial Sin by the Church cannot be fairly treated as a criminal offence by the State—that, when putting in practice “what every *Christian* must know and do,” he cannot be acting contrary to what every *subject* should know and do; and that hence, when prosecuted by the civil law for what the Church allows, but what the State forbids, he will regard the prosecution as an unjust assault upon the authority of the “Catholic Church,” and a persecuting procedure against the privileges of his religion.

The great political distinction of the Romish Creed is the doctrine of Ecclesiastical Supremacy. Some Roman Catholics dispute the supremacy as regards temporals; but *all* agree that the authority of the Church is above that of the State in the sphere of religion and morals. Such a religious and moral supremacy implies that, at least, the criminal law of the State should be based upon and assimilated to the moral law of the Church. This being assumed as granted by all Romanists, if the moral theology which has just been exemplified as the undoubted present-day teaching of the Church of Rome should be thus made the basis of the criminal code in this or any other State, we have only to ask—What would be soon the condition of society where such a legislation had been set up? And the answer which Rome herself has practically given to the question is—Just the condition of society in the political territory at present governed by Pius IX. Here the civil law is based upon the religious and moral

law of the Church, or rather the two, civil and ecclesiastical law, are identified ; and here, too, is to be found precisely such fruits as might be expected from the moral teaching which has been examined. If any one wishes to be informed of the evils of the Popish Government, he has only to consult the celebrated work of Edmund About,* a Romanist himself, in order to be fully satisfied that no ruler ever succeeded more effectually in reducing his subjects to the lowest degree of moral turpitude, social disorder, and political dissatisfaction, than his Apostolic Majesty, who reigns as “Successor of Peter, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.”

Penance no Sacrament.

Every Sacrament of the Church of Rome, in regard to external elements, is comprised under two parts—the matter and form. The matter in the Sacrament of Penance consists of the acts of the penitent, which are attrition,† confession, and satisfaction, and the form is contained in the words of absolution pronounced by the priest, “*Ego te absolvo.*” The sacramental anomalies connected with the constitution of this ordinance sufficiently demonstrate that it has no religious, much less a scriptural basis—that it has none of the characteristics of a sacrament, even as such an ordinance is defined by the teaching of the Church of Rome herself.

In the first place, this ordinance is notoriously deficient in the primary element necessary to the constitution of a sacrament—namely, the “matter,” or the visible sign, which is the very essence of a sacrament, and which in other cases, as in “Confirmation,” the Church has provided one of her own manufacture called “Chrism.” Why she

* Translated by H. C. Coape. London: W. Jeffs, 15 Burlington Arcade.

† Some substitute “contrition” for attrition, as the first part of the sacrament. But this is a mistake; for nothing belongs to the constitution of a sacrament except what forms a *necessary part* of the ordinance. But, according to all Romish theologians, contrition is not necessary to the validity of this sacrament, for attrition will do; therefore attrition, and not contrition, is the proper first part of Penance.

failed or neglected to resort to a similar expedient in the Sacrament of Penance is not easily explained. She had as much Scripture for the use of Chrism in the one case as the other. That the sacrament is utterly *matterless* is acknowledged by the teaching of the Council of Trent itself, which, obviously conscious of the awkwardness of calling the acts of the penitent the matter, tries to *mend the matter* (excuse the pun) by calling it the “quasi matter,” (*quasi materia*,)—that is, the “*as if* matter,” or “the matter as it were.”

The compilers of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, already several times quoted, not satisfied with this suppositious, or “as-it-were matter,” offers the following singular apology for the Council, in which all must agree “the matter” is made the worse for the mending :—

“When the Holy Council says that they (the acts of the penitent) are ‘the matter as *it were*,’ it is not because they are not the real matter, but because they are not, like water in baptism, and chrism in confirmation, matter that may be applied externally. With regard to the opinion of some, who hold that the *sins themselves* constitute the matter of this sacrament, if well weighed, it will not be found to differ from what has been already laid down. We say that wood which is consumed by fire is the matter of fire ; and sins which are destroyed by penance may also be called with propriety the matter of penance.”—*Donovan’s Ed.*, p. 258.

This is, perhaps, the most extraordinary theological delivery ever broached by Infallibility. First, we are told that the Council does not call the acts of the penitent “matter as it were,” because they are not real matter, but matter that may be applied *externally*. The acts of the penitent, therefore, are real matter applied *internally*! Does not the *internal application of attrition, confession, and satisfaction* rival some of the profoundest nonsense found in the school jargon of transubstantiation itself?

Again, the Catechism says, the opinion that “the sins themselves constitute the matter of this sacrament if well weighed does not differ from the view that the acts of the penitent are the matter”—that is, the acts of the penitent in the commission of sin and the acts of the penitent for the remission of sin, are not only equally the matter of the

sacrament, but the same matter—the one view “does not differ” from the other! Nothing in the history of theological paradox ever excelled this, unless it be the further absurdity contained in the discovered analogy that a sacrament consumes its own matter as fire consumes wood! The “*opus operatum*” of a Romish sacrament was once supposed to imply an operation of inexplicable mystery, but the Catechism illuminates the difficulty by the analogy of fire and the process which, according to the illustration, may be designated sacramental combustion.

The analogy supplies some comfort to the sinner, even before he becomes absolved as a penitent; for if sin be the matter of the sacrament in question, then when the drunkard (for example) is engaged in swallowing his dram, or a thief in purloining an honest man’s property, each of these delinquents is simply providing himself with the matter of a sacrament!

But Penance, viewed as a sacramental institution, is fraught with exhaustless anomalies. In a true sacrament the material emblem, as the water in Baptism, and the bread or wine in the Lord’s Supper, is conveyed from the minister to the penitent; but in Penance the matter passes *from the penitent to the priest*. The penitent expresses the attrition *to the priest*, he makes the confession *to the priest*, and he makes the satisfaction *to the priest*, (because he makes satisfaction to God; and the priest, we are told, sits in the Confessional, not as man, but as God.—*Catechism of the Council of Trent*.) The only act which proceeds from the priest to the penitent is the form of absolution—“*Ego te absolvo*,” I absolve thee. Here was the place for the matter or outward sign. A little chrism applied to the penitent simultaneously with these words would have fabricated a false sacrament, but it would have been *like* a true one.

Thus not only is this sacrament without a sacramental matter, but the “*quasi matter*” is administered by the penitent to the priest, instead of by the priest to the penitent; and as if to make this sacramental blundering complete, while the penitent assumes the position of the priest in relation to the matter, the priest, who is called

the confessor, assumes the name of the penitent. The word confessor, in its etymological, popular, and proper meaning, signifies not one who *hears*, but one who *makes* confession. Hence the martyrs, or those who bore strong testimony to Christ by confessing or professing His doctrine under the experience of persecution, are called confessors. The assumption of the term by the Popish official is evidently intended to imply that he is entitled to this honourable epithet, applied to distinguish the true and suffering witnesses of Christ. The application of this term to the Popish official who hears confession should be quietly abandoned by Protestants, and some appropriate term, as *confessionist*, employed in its stead.

If Penance has no claim to a sacrament as respects the first requirement, called "the matter," it has as little claim as it respects the second essential, called "the form." The form which the priest employs is the Latin expression, "*Ego absolvo te*," I absolve thee ; but this expression, or any equivalent for it, is no more to be found in Scripture than "the matter." The Church of Rome, therefore, has derived the form by far-fetched inference from a much-abused Scripture text, to which only a passing reference can be here made.

The offices of Christ are essentially twofold—the *sacerdotal* and *sovereign*, or sacred and civil. In His sacred office He is a Priest and Prophet, in His civil office a King and Judge. In the so-called sacrament of Penance the Romish official puts off the sacerdotal, and usurps the civil office of Christ. A mere mortal, one equally contaminated, guilty, and morally helpless with the deluded penitent that approaches his knee, ascends the judicial seat of Christ, and thence professes to adjudge pardon, penance, or perdition, with an arrogant and presumptuous confidence, in which his unhappy penitent participates, that "whose soever sins he remits they are remitted, and whose soever sins he retains they are retained," (John xx. 23.)

If the apostles understood these words as a Romish priest professes to receive them, then they, like he, must have adopted the form, "*Ego absolvo te*." But though the

apostles remitted sins in thousands of cases referred to in the New Testament, we never, in a single instance, find one receiving this remission of sin after the fashion of an "*absolvo te*," and the routine of the confession-box. According to the apostolic exercise of this commission, sins are remitted or retained by the doctrine the apostles preached, the burden of which was, that he who believed should be saved, and he who believed not should be condemned. Hence the commission involved a double message—a declaration of the ground of *justification*, and a declaration of the ground of *condemnation*; and these declarations (or the doctrine they include) respectively remit or retain sin, just as we receive or reject the message of salvation concerning Christ. This, if we interpret the apostles' commission by their practice, is the simple meaning of a text in which the priest has found his "*absolvo te*," and all the other judicial elements associated with the ordeal of

The Confessional.

The phrase Confessional is one controversially employed to express the whole of the ordinances associated in the sacrament of Penance, with the act of *Confession* viewed as the central and prominent part of the Institution. All the religious tenets of the creed of Pope Pius IV. are, as we have seen, devised with the utmost adaptation to the secular advantages and political influence of the Romish priesthood. But every other tenet, or practical ordinance, must yield in this respect to the ordinance called Penance. If this rite has no adaptation whatever to the service of religion—if, as has been shown, it is perfectly devoid of all congruity as a religious ordinance—it has no such defects when viewed in its true character as an ecclesiastical engine for the promotion of secular and political enterprise. Here the means and the end are in perfect harmony, and the wisdom of Satan, combined with the skill of priestcraft, never contrived a more adequate and successful instrument for the corruption of human morality, and for advancing the temporal projects of an avaricious and ambitious priesthood.

Reasoning on the *a priori* principle of the logician, it

must be evident that a class of individuals mingling in the general mass of society, and privileged by this ordinance to learn the secrets of individuals, have a vast advantage over their fellow-subjects in the battle of life. *Knowledge is power* in every art, but especially in the art of governing men, and making them subservient to our designs. He who knows the opinions, failures, or faults of another must possess a consequent and corresponding influence over the individual so known,—he who knows the family secrets will have a similar power over the family, and so on in the priest's connexion with every form of social life. That such a power has not only been acquired, but applied by the priest, either to accomplish his personal ends, or promote the secular interest of his Church, is amply verified by experience, and by the testimony of history. Does the priest wish to serve his personal interest, or to gratify some of the longings of that corrupt nature which he possesses in common with the rest of mankind?—the Confessional contributes to the knowledge, and perhaps affords the direct opportunity by which to effect his purpose. Does he engage in a proselytising intrigue?—the Confessional supplies the surest and shortest road to success. Does he wish to accomplish a clandestine baptism?—the Confessional is the facile channel through which information is received and instruction given for the successful performance of every new act of Mortaraism. Does he wish to invade the authority of parents, and recruit some neighbouring nunnery by enticing one or more weak-minded girls of a family or neighbourhood?—the Confessional affords the means of supplying the counsel and maturing the plans to effect this most criminal of all domestic robberies. Does the priest wish to compass the acquisition of a death-bed legacy? to defeat some political measure? to construct some treasonable plot? in a word, to bring to a successful issue any personal or ecclesiastical scheme?—the Confessional is the great foundation of his hopes, and affords the readiest means of constructing his plans and giving effect to his efforts.

The joint influence of Celibacy and the Confessional is quite enough to deluge society with immorality; but to

heighten the causes of the evil, a combination of disciplinary accessories have been added, which has made Popery a training school for the propagation of a degree and kind of debauchery unexampled in the history of human lewdness, and scarcely to be realised in the imagination of the most depraved! The first part of this Confessional discipline is the

Confessional Training of the Priest.

The text-books which have been compiled for this department of priestly culture are by far the foulest depositories of moral filth which have ever fallen from the pen of obscenity. As caterers for this style of priestly culture, Dens and Liguori stand in the first rank. Dens, with an ardent relish for the style of inquiry, has discussed obscenity with the methodical precision of a science, and treated practical debauchery as a department of fine art! The polluting imagery of this "filthy dreamer" has been partially transferred from its Latin original to an English translation, in a pamphlet by a Dublin editor, "*Odontomisetes*;" being obliged to employ this *nom-de-plume* by his unwillingness to have his name associated with the disgusting task which he so courageously undertook under a sense of duty.

The like task executed by this author in relation to Dens, has been performed by the Rev. R. P. Blakeney in reference to the almost equally polluted pages of Liguori.

All reference to the obscene contents of the treatises referred to are here excluded, as unnecessary to the object of these pages. It is sufficient to direct attention to the necessary consequences of such training. The combined influence of Celibacy and the Confessional was not enough to satisfy the malignity of Satan in his efforts to compass the destruction of all moral principle in the Romish priest. To stimulate what might otherwise be a controllable appetite, the unhappy victims of Satanic power are sent to meet their penitents in the Confessional under the influence of a mind filled with pictures of lewdness, and occupied with a class of debauched thoughts which cannot but result in an equally debauched practice,

To put the top-stone on the work of Rome's demoralising morality, she extends the process of Confessional training from the priest to the penitent—from the art of *hearing* confession to the art of *making* confession. The process of training in both cases may be called the art of schooling Papists to understand and practise sins, of which they had not only been previously innocent, but wholly ignorant. The training manuals designed to qualify the laity in the art of Sacramental Confession contain what are called "Tables of Sin," with catechetical exercises for self-examination under each of the Ten Commandments.

In the construction of these tables and questions, the sole view taken of the Commandments is the *negative* or prohibitory. The principle that every sin prohibited commands the opposite duty—as the command forbidding murder imposes the obligation of preserving and supporting life—is totally ignored. Hence all the questions concern sins incurred by transgression, to the exclusion of sins incurred by omission; although, according to Scripture teaching, sins of omission are not only "mortal sins," but the sins of this character will constitute the exclusive ground of condemnation at the last day, (Matt. xxv.)

Weighty reasons, no doubt, required Popery to ignore this class of mortal sin in Confessional practice. By a course of examination, including sins of omission, the priest's labour would be infinitely enhanced, without in any material degree advancing the secular designs of the Confessional. For every "mortal sin" by transgression, we incur scores of equivalent or greater sins by omission. Hence the priests, if it were only through sheer inability for the labour, were compelled to exclude this class of moral offences from their tables of sin, and other helps in the art of confessing made easy. Hence, also, as the Church requires all *mortal* sins to be confessed, when she practically ignores the necessity of confessing sins of omission, to make her theology square with her practice, all sins of omission must be accounted venial sins.

These tables of sin and questions for self-examination form a suitable counterpart to the course of instruction by

which the priest qualifies himself for the task of hearing Confession. In each case the process of culture is calculated to constitute the most debasing preparation for the

Confessional Intercourse of Priest and Penitent.

Romish Confession is no mere voluntary exercise in which the penitent, as in the Greek Church, submits the burden of a troubled conscience and its cause to a fellow-mortal for counsel and advice. The priest of Rome is not merely a hearer of Confession, but an *examiner*, qualified by his training to wring out, with the skill and success of a practical legal advocate, secrets of the mind and heart which often rival in the development of licentious profligacy, the most disgusting revealments of a Divorce Court. By the interrogatory privilege and process, the priest can shape his inquiries in any direction which may suit a sinister object, or give him insight for the accomplishment of any corrupt desire.

The evils which result from the Confessional are all intensified when the confessor has to undertake the disgusting task of examining the opposite sex upon sins which lead to the disclosure of obscene, beastly, and mutually contaminating communications. Matters which the Scriptures forbid even "to be named among us, as becometh saints," are then made the topics of familiar and revolting dialogue, with the common result described in the well-known lines—

"Vice is a monster of such hideous mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too often, familiar with her face,
We soon approve, admire, and then embrace."

The most virtuous female needs but a very few applications to the duties of the Confessional to blunt for ever the defensive weapons of the grand guardian of female virtue—Modesty.

"Teach that Heaven-stationed sentinel, (says the Dublin pamphlet,) to slumber on his post, or cease to unfurl his crimson banner on woman's cheek, and it requires but small pains to scale the walls,

and take possession of the fortress. . . . When a woman can sit a catechumen in impurity without a flush, her purity is gone."

The truth of these statements, and the frightful consequences of the Confessional in the destruction of female chastity, and the consequent spread of social immorality, require some further remarks, on—

The Confessional a great Source and Propagator of "The Social Evil," in Romish Countries.

Even Protestant countries are now being statistically self-accused for the existing amount of the social crime which has come to be distinguished by the above title. The *candour* of Protestant communities, and the pains taken to *reveal* instead of to *conceal* the features of this evil, have doubtless made the comparison of Romish and Protestant countries in this respect less favourable to the latter than a fair examination of the question would allow. Scotland has lately been made to appear to more than usual disadvantage by this comparison, from a cause evidently overlooked—the fact that numbers of the humbler Scotch mate with each other without the formalities of a marriage, but with the honest intention of mutual fidelity, and commonly of having that ceremony performed at a convenient season.* Children born before the formal marriage, which as a general rule may be reckoned on, thus come to be registered as illegitimate; while taking the mutual engagements of the parents to each other, which in almost every case bind them as faithfully as a formal ceremony, such children are, in a moral estimate of the case, no wise to be classed with the offspring of that brutal, unprincipled, and promiscuous concubinage which characterises Popish lands, and especially the Popish priesthood.

Prior to the Reformation, what has now become a *social* evil was comparatively an *ecclesiastical* one; and from the testimony of history, we may be safe in concluding that the one is but the offspring of the other. In Scotland the licentiousness of the priesthood was so prevalent and

* When the formal marriage comes to be realised, all children previously born are thereby legitimatised, in Scotch law.

familiar, that the very names of a large number of the present-day families are expressive of sonship derived from ecclesiastical parentage.

"The profligacy of the Scottish clergy on the eve of the Reformation was such that it stamped itself even on the names given at baptism to children. The common Scottish names, Macnab, Mac-taggart, and Macpherson are, (according to their etymological signification,) *son of an abbot, of a priest, of a parson.*"—*Robertson's Sketches, Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*. 1854. Note, p. 182.

Scotland, however, was only a sharer in the general profligacy which heretofore distinguished the Pope and clergy, according to the testimonies of their own historians, from which a single extract will be sufficient here.

The opening chapter of the eleventh century in the Church History of the Jesuit Reeve thus commences :—

"Simony and incontinence had struck deep root among the *clergy* of England, Italy, Germany, and France. The evil began under those unworthy POPES who shamefully disgraced the tiara by their immoral conduct in the tenth century. The scandal spread, and had now continued so long that the inferior clergy *pleaded custom for their irregularities*. Many even of the *bishops* were equally unfaithful to their vow, and with greater guilt. Hence the corrupt laity, being under no apprehension of a reproof from men so deeply immersed in vice as they, gave free scope to their passions. To stem the torrent of so general a licentiousness which then deluged the Christian world, required the zeal and fortitude of an apostle."—*Reeve's History of the Church*. Ed. of 1844, p. 300.

The apostolic reformer to whom Reeve ascribes the first effort "to stem the torrent of so general a licentiousness," was Gregory VII. But the torrent was too strong to be stemmed by this or any succeeding Pope, and for the simple reason, that the Popes did not commence the reformation with themselves, from whom, according to Reeve, the "evil began." To purify the streams, we must begin where the evil begins—the fountain. So long as the Popes themselves continued to set the example of unparalleled debauchery, it was quite in vain to expect that the clergy and laity would be effectually influenced by the coercive measures which the Pope proceeded to apply. The coercive means employed by the head of the Church effected a change, but no improvement in the practice of its profligacy.

gate members. The "custom" of living openly in fornication with concubines was by degrees abolished, but the vice was suppressed only to find another and more destructive channel through the seductive facilities of the *Confessional*. Here the inherent sore produced by Celibacy again broke out with fresh violence, and so threatened the dismemberment of the whole Papacy through the sheer profligacy of the system, that the Popes were compelled to employ the most stringent means to cure the evils of their own creating.

The "Social Evil" resulting from the Confessional was as general as that referred to by Reeve under its previous form, or "the custom of concubinage;" but as Spain was always the *most* Catholic country of Europe, here, as a necessary consequence, was the *most* alarming development of the evil, and here accordingly the Pope was obliged to employ the most vigorous application of his coercive discipline. How far these means were successful will be seen by another short extract or two referring to the remedy and its results.

About the year 1560, a Bull was issued by Pope Pius IV., directing the Inquisition of Spain to investigate the reports which excited public attention to the crime of "soliciting" female penitents in the Confessional; the Bull commencing as follows:—

"Whereas certain ecclesiastics in the kingdom of Spain, and in the cities and dioceses thereof, having the cure of souls, or exercising such cure for others, or otherwise deputed to hear the confessions of penitents, *have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity* as to abuse the Sacrament of Penance in the very act of hearing the confessions, nor fearing to injure the same sacrament, and Him who instituted it, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by enticing and provoking, or trying to entice and provoke, females to lewd actions at the very time when they were making their confessions," &c., &c.

Such was the tenor of the first of a series of Bulls, by which the Popes hoped to suppress the scandal which had spread, and to deliver the Papacy from consequences likely to be as extensive as the magnitude of the evil. The result of these efforts are thus made known by the narrator:—

"When the bull was first introduced into Spain, the inquisitors

published, a solemn edict in all the churches belonging to the Archbishopric of Seville, that any person knowing, or having heard of, any friar or clergyman having committed the crime of abusing the Sacrament of Confession, or in any manner having improperly conducted himself during the confession of a female penitent, should make a discovery of what he knew within thirty days to the Holy Tribunal, and very heavy censures were attached to those who should neglect or despise the injunction. When this edict was first published, such a considerable number of females went to the palace of the inquisitor only in the city of Seville, to reveal the conduct of their infamous confessors, that *twenty* notaries, and as many inquisitors, were appointed to minute down their several informations against them; but these being found insufficient to receive the depositions of so many witnesses, and the Inquisition being thus overwhelmed, as it were, with the pressure of such affairs, thirty days more were allowed for taking the accusations, and this lapse of time also proving inadequate to the intended purpose, a similar period was granted, not only for a third, but a fourth time. The ladies of rank, character, and noble families had a difficult part to act on this occasion, as their discoveries could not be made of any particular time and place. On one side, a religious fear of incurring the threatened censures goaded their consciences so much as to compel them to make the required accusation; on the other side, a regard to their husbands, to whom they justly feared to give offence, by affording them any grounds for suspecting their private conduct, induced them to keep at home. To obviate these difficulties they had recourse to the measure of covering their faces with a vail, according to the fashion of Spain, and thus went to the inquisitors in the most secret manner they could adopt. Very few, however, escaped the vigilance of their husbands, who, on being informed of the discoveries and accusations made by their wives, were filled with suspicions. And yet, notwithstanding the accumulation of proof against the confessors produced to the inquisitors, this Holy Tribunal, contrary to the expectations of every one, put an end to the business by ordering that all crimes of this nature, proved by lawful evidence, should from thenceforth be consigned to perpetual silence and oblivion."—See for the references to originals, &c., *Elliot's Delineations of Roman Catholicism*, p. 211.

Elliot adds:—The disease was general. It was not confined to the countries of Spain and Portugal, those hotbeds of priestly domination and sin; it was rife in England, France, and even Germany.

Thus the moral history of Popery, by its own pens, sufficiently demonstrates that the Church of Rome is not merely "the mother of fornications," in the prophetic and mystical

sense of idolatry, but in the literal sense of which Reeve complains when he says, the evil having begun with the Popes themselves, thence descended to the bishops and clergy, and from them again to the laity of the Church, until "the torrent of a general licentiousness deluged the Christian world;" and we may safely add, until by its polluting streams it continued to operate in the production of the moral plague which has reached our day, and which, for its bad eminence, we now designate "the Social Evil."

Seal of the Confessional.

To induce the laity to make the most unreserved disclosure of their secret sins, including, as the priest may require, the sins of others as well as those of the party confessing, the priests of Rome have always used the utmost industry to propagate the doctrine of the confessional bond, technically called the "Seal of the Confessional." The priests are well aware that the very existence of this institution depends upon the belief in this Seal; and, in their efforts to secure the fullest confidence against the possibility of divulgement, many have propagated the notion that, immediately after the confession is made, and absolution granted, God, by a special interposition of His power, obliterates all the revelations made in the Confessional from the mind of the priest!

The subject of "the Seal" is thus treated by Dens and others, the present most approved expositors of the moral theology of Popery:—

"What is the seal of the confessional?"

"It is the obligation or duty of concealing those things which are learnt from sacramental confession."—*Dens' Theology*, vol. vi. p. 218.

"Can a case be given in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal?"

"It cannot, although the life or safety of a man depended thereon, or even the destruction of the commonwealth. Nor can the Supreme Pontiff give dispensation in this; so that, on that account, this secret of the seal is more binding than the obligation of an oath, a vow, a natural secret, &c., and that by the positive will of God.

"What answer, then, ought a confessor to give when questioned

concerning a truth which he knows from sacramental confession only?

"He ought to answer, that he does not know it; and, if necessary, confirm the same with an oath."—*Ibid.*, p. 219.

"Objection. In no case is it lawful to declare a lie. But that confessor would be guilty of a lie because he knows the truth; therefore, &c.

"Ans. I deny the minor; because such confessor is interrogated *as man*. But now he does not know that truth as man, *although he knows it as God*."—*Ibid.*

De la Hogue, author of another of those class-books whose instructions are communicated in the Maynooth and other Popish colleges of Ireland, has a like course of deliverances on the subject of the Seal, of which the following is a sample:—

"If a priest is questioned by a magistrate as to matters which he has learnt from confession alone, he ought to reply that he is ignorant of them; nay, he ought to swear it, which he may do without *any danger of falsehood*. It is decided by the judgment of Estius that, in doing so, he neither lies nor equivocates, since he frames a true reply to the intention of the person interrogating him, because the magistrate does not ask him what he knows from confession *in his character as God*, but what he knows in his character as man without confession."—*De la Hogue*, vol. i. p. 292.

Thus the civil magistrate is bound to recognise the oath of the priest as valid, provided the latter adds blasphemy to perjury, or swears falsely in the *person of God*!

"In fine," says Dens, "all things are reduced indirectly to the seal, by the revealing of which the sacrament would be made odious, according to the manners of the country and circumstances of the times; and thus Steyart observes, from Wiggers, that some things are at *one time* opposed to the seal which at *another time* are not considered as such."—*Dens*, vol. vi. p. 222.

This last deliverance obviously intimates that "the Seal" is not absolutely inviolable; and, accordingly, it gradually oozes out, from further admissions of these casuists, that, notwithstanding all their fine declamation about the sacredness of the confessional trust,

The Seal is Dispensable for the Good of the Church.

"Does a confessor, narrating the sins which he has heard in confession, act contrary to the seal?

"If the sinner or person can by no means be discovered, not even in general, nor any *prejudice to the priest himself happen therefrom*, he does not act contrary to the seal, because the seal has reference to the penitent or sinner. Wherefore the Doctors providently advise that we should abstain from these narratives *when not moved by reason of utility*."—*Dens*, vol. vi. pp. 222, 223.

"What persons contract the obligations of the sacramental seal?"

"All those who have got their knowledge from confession, mediately or immediately, lawfully or unlawfully. In this manner interpreters in confession* are bound by the seal, and those who, sitting about the confessional, accidentally hear anything. But they commit sin who voluntarily listen or hear. In like manner they are bound by the seal to whom the confessor has revealed without the licence of the penitent."

This last revelation of the priest without the licence of the penitent, of course, also means a revelation "*accidentally*" or unintentionally made, as it is hardly to be supposed that *Dens* would so plainly teach that the confessor voluntarily "revealed without the licence of the penitent." But, even so, it is an admission that the secrets of the Confessional are committed to a fallible depository, and that they may come to be divulged, at least, accidentally. The admission provides an easy means of escape when the priest does reveal the secrets of his penitent, as, if such a revelation should be discovered, it is very easy for a class of individuals so privileged to lie, to refer the revelation to an accidental cause.

The Confessional guide then goes on to ask, among others, the question—

"Can a confessor, with licence of the penitent, disclose what he has heard in that penitent's confession?"

To which he gives an affirmative answer, and then supposes this

"Objection. Bad priests could thus abuse the seal by saying they had liberty.

"St Thomas answers, it is incumbent on them to prove they have received the licence. But a confessor is to *be believed when he swears he has obtained licence from the penitent*;"

* When the priest and the penitent happen to speak different languages an *interpreter* has to be employed, and thus the penitent's secrets become exposed to two parties instead of one.

that is, of course, whether the penitent swears the contrary or not.

Then the question is taken up which supposes a penitent unwilling to give consent to some disclosure which the priest wishes to make; and here is the direction in the case :—

“ Du Jardin, and also Suarez, Antoine, and Sylvius remark, that a penitent can sometimes *be compelled* to concede some such licence, or OTHERWISE BE NOT ABSOLVED.”—*Ibid.*, pp. 332-4.

Again, we read in the same author :—

“ Is it lawful for a confessor to avail himself of that knowledge which he has acquired solely from the sacramental confession of another ?

“ Although it is always unlawful to break the seal, however it is inquired, whether it is contrary to the reverence of the seal to do anything or to omit anything on account of that knowledge, which the confessor could otherwise not have done? To which it is answered—

“ It is sometimes contrary to the seal, and sometimes *not*.

“ When is it contrary to the seal to make use of the knowledge of confession ?

“ When it is attended with danger, lest anything be revealed, directly or indirectly, respecting the confession of a *known* person. Nay, although no such danger appears, and although it be not known that the confessor avails himself of the knowledge of confession ; yet, if it might turn out to be a real or apprehended grievance to the penitent or his accomplice, it would be acting contrary to the seal, *inasmuch as confession would then be rendered odious* ; for instance, if a confessor should, from the sole knowledge of confession, deny a penitent or his accomplice a testimonial of morals.”—*Ibid.*, p. 335.

Thus, while this expounder of his Church's principles commences his present dissertation with a formal and positive declaration, that matters revealed in the Confessional are inviolably sealed, and this by the positive will of God, yet, by Jesuitical exceptions and casuistry, his teaching ultimately discloses that what he first defines to be *an inviolable class of secrets* are no secrets at all—that “ things at *one time* opposed to the Seal, at *another time* are not”—that the priest may disclose them for “ utility,” and that

he may disclose them with the permission of the penitent, *extorted by the threat of withholding absolution, and consigning his soul to the pains of hell for ever!*

Lastly, he divulges the important admission, that the priest may employ the knowledge he acquires in the Confessional in any way serviceable to himself, which is not at the same time injurious to any "known penitent." This knowledge, or the power to apply it, even with the restriction just mentioned, must be of the utmost advantage to an intriguing and speculating priest. In what a multitude of circumstances may not such knowledge be turned to account in his various secular projects and social intercourse! Hints taken up from the penitent may often open up a mine of good fortune to a clear-headed confessionalist, solely occupied in prosecuting the financial or other ambitious schemes of a conspiracy leagued against the rights of human society, and the best interests of man.

Compulsory Obligations of the Confessional.

Pius IX. in his extraordinary Ukase of 8th Dec. 1864, or rather in its more extraordinary "syllabus," reminds the world that he still retains the power to "employ force" in the service of the Church.—*Syllabus, prop.* 80.

Had the Pope, by this proposition, meant that he still retained the power to employ cannon shot to support canon law in the remnant of Peter's patrimony over which he reigns by the grace of Napoleon III., no one could deny the literal verity of the proposition quoted. It is, however, consolatory to know that even the "power to employ force" in this way will, in all likelihood, find its termination in the ominous year of 1866.

But the Pope's proposition is evidently intended to comprise more than the local application of the force necessary to preserve the kingdom and prerogatives of the secular Papacy. The canons already quoted from the Council of Trent on Baptism empower the Pope to employ force for the purpose of compelling the baptised to fulfil the religious engagements of that ordinance. The Council, as we have seen, curses all who say that the baptised "are to be

left to their own will, and are not to be *compelled* to a Christian life.”—*Sess. 7, canon 14.*

What may be included in the duties of a “Christian life” cannot be easily determined by any but the Pope himself; but all Roman Catholics must agree that such a life embraces the due observance of sacramental Confession—an observance which the Church of Rome makes canonically binding on all her members, at least once a year.—*Fourth Council of Lateran.*

The connexion, then, between the canonical obligations of Baptism and Penance is plain. Baptism imposes on all the obligations of a Christian life. The duties of this Christian life may be enforced by the Pope; Penance is one of the most essential of these duties: therefore the duty of Penance may be enforced by the Pope. Fortunately for most Roman Catholics, the Pope’s actual power to employ force is not so catholic as his doctrine; and that, except within the now contracted jurisdiction of Peter’s patrimony, and perhaps some parts of Spain, compulsory, and even voluntary Confession, is fast growing out of date in Catholic States.

In Peter’s patrimony sacramental Confession, once a year, is of course duly regulated and enforced by the Pope’s civil arm; and as to Spain, where Popery reigns with the next degree of tyranny, the mode of procedure to compel attendance upon the confessional will be seen by the references supplied.

“I find in Spain,” says Fleury, already quoted, “*forced penances* as early as the seventeenth century. The bishops, seeing that several sinners never came to submit to penance, complained of it in the Parliament, and entreated the princes to oblige them to it by their temporal power.”—*Fleury’s Third Discourse on Eccles. Hist.*

Further on, the same historian remarks—

“In order to render penance more sensible,” (that is, by attrition arising from loss to the pocket,) “*pecuniary fines* were added, which were exacted before absolution was given; and provided *they* were paid, the *rest* of the penance was easily passed over.”—*Fleury’s Fourth Discourse on Eccles. Hist.*

Another witness of the more modern practice in Spain supplies the following :—

“Confession is one of the sacraments of the Church of Rome. Roman Catholicism, at least in Spain, requires that all believers shall celebrate that sacrament as well as the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, at least once a year.

“The method employed by the clergy to discover delinquents with reference to these obligations, (of the Confessional,) is as rigid and severe as any that can be devised by the most despotic civil authority. About the middle of Lent the priest and one of his assistants form a general census of all their parishioners. In the acts of Confession and Communion the penitent receives two tickets, which certify his obedience to the paschal precept; and when the assigned period is over for these observances, the priest goes from house to house to gather the tickets, so that it is impossible to conceal any infraction of the rule. Until within the last two years it was the custom to write the *names of all defaulters upon a board exposed to public view in the churches*, by way of punishment of the delinquents, and, consequently, those who were the subjects of this punishment were badly looked upon by the towns people, and considered as atheists and heretics.”

The writer adds—

“Whether it was on account of a grave inconvenience resulting from this mode of punishment, or by virtue of that decay in the ecclesiastical influence in Spain, so notable in recent years, we cannot determine, but that practice has now been completely abolished; and even in Madrid and the principal cities of the kingdom, the ‘complying with the Church’ *has lost its compulsory character*,” &c. —*Roman Catholicism in Spain*. Edinburgh : Johnstone & Hunter. 1855.

Thus we see that the Pope’s power to “employ force” is happily becoming

“Small by degrees, and beautifully less.”

Hence the present-day rapid abridgment of the Pope’s political and coercive ability, and the consequent decline of the Confessional, the great sheet-anchor of Peter’s barque, necessitates the future employment of moral, instead of physical means, to sustain the Confessional system. The Pope’s theology teaches that sin is a transgression of God’s law, but much more of canon law. Transgressions of God’s law are seldom more than venial sin, while transgressions

of the Pope's law are always mortal. The priest industriously teaches that one of the greatest of these mortal sins is a violation of canon law by the neglect of Confession. So long as Roman Catholics put faith in this teaching, of course the superstitious will employ the Confessional as a relief to the conscience, and the priest as the "rod of his power." While, however, such a faith, and a consequent Confessional practice, are every day declining in the abodes of Romanism, the baneful spread of Popery in this Protestant empire is no way more significantly marked than by the

Progress of the Confessional in Britain.

In the introductory part of this little work a reference was made to the progress of Popery at home, and its collateral decline abroad. A pamphlet, published by the Roman Catholic Bishop Hughes of America, was also referred to for evidence on the subject of the "decline of Protestantism." It may be some consolation to learn that this declension of Protestantism is in some measure compensated by its progress abroad. At least the Protestants of New York, where Bishop Hughes's pamphlet was published, seem to have drawn consolation from this consideration. A correspondent of the *New York Christian Times* thus writes :—

"I have before me 'A Catechism concerning Protestantism, for the use of the People.' It is a recent work of a favourite of the Pope's, and has passed rapidly through many editions. The reason given for its issue is *the alarming increase of Protestantism*—openly in the kingdom of Italy, and secretly in the Papal States. The preface states that *many* permit themselves to be seduced by the pleasing prospect which is placed before them; many permit themselves to be entangled in the arguments, or rather sophisms, which impious men use to make proselytes. They know not the real hideousness of Protestantism, and the utter ruin into which Italy would fall if it were deprived of its greatest blessing, the Catholic religion."

Perhaps the best of all evidence with respect to the facts referred to in the preceding paragraph, is that afforded by the institution called the Confessional. The condition of

the Confessional is the touch-stone of Popery. Where the Confessional languishes, there Popery declines. Where the Confessional is found in popular and expansive operation, there Popery proportionably progresses. It is notorious that the decline of continental Popery has been marked by the general neglect of the Confessional, and it is further obvious that the progress of Popery in Britain has been equally concurrent with the activity and spread of auricular drill. This progress of the Confessional in Popery proper is sufficiently alarming, but the development of the institution under the modern, or rather the ancient phase—for Puseyism is even older than Popery—of Tractarianism, is a still more symptomatic evidence of the apostacy of British Christendom, or at least of the English Church. The Establishment has not only adopted the Secret Confessional, the disguised conventual system, and monastic mummeries of the “Sister Church,” but all these importations are being daily assimilated to the highest type of the Popish original. The English Confessional, according to the *Union*, the organ of Tractarian progress, has now arrived at a positive identity with the Popish pattern :—

“The mode of making and receiving Confession is substantially identical—the same questions are asked, the same sort of penances are given, the same consolation offered, and it appears to us somewhat dishonest to pretend that it is otherwise.”—*Union of 20th August 1864.*

Thus the Confessional innovations introduced by the Puseyite apostacy have not only developed into full-grown Popery, but the *Union* candidly stigmatises any attempt to deny the fact as an exhibition of dishonesty.

Later manifestations make known to us that, taking advantage of a somewhat laxly worded canon (Can. 113) of the Church of England, the Tractarian Confessional stickles to maintain the satanic bond called the “Seal,” with the same defiance of civil law as the lawless system of the Papacy. The canon reads—

“Provided always, If any man confess his secret and hidden sins

to the minister, for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him, we do not any way bind the said minister by this our Constitution, but do strictly charge and admonish that he do not at any time reveal and make known to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy, (except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called in question for concealing the same,) under pain of irregularity."

This canon, passed in the year 1604, forms no reasonable ground for Tractarian perfidy, as the canons (unlike the Prayer-Book and the thirty-nine Articles of the Church) *never received confirmation or acknowledgment by Parliament*. How plainly this instance teaches the necessity for the supervision and control of the civil power in relation to the legislation of Churchmen! Had any ecclesiastical convocation a right to exercise an independent jurisdiction, the authors of the above canon would have clearly overridden (with the single exception involving the peril of the minister's life) one of the fundamental provisions of the statute-book in relation to witness-bearing.

Our present political safeguards are, nevertheless, totally insufficient to cope with the civil abuses of the Confessional, as may be easily manifested by a few references to recent cases involving

Collisions between the Operations of the Confessional and Civil Law.

The principles of civil law, with respect to the concealment of crime, whether intended or already perpetrated, and more especially with respect to the concealment and reception of property fraudulently acquired, are clear and manifest. The practice of the Confessional, by making the priest cognisant both of intended and perpetrated crime, involves him in at least four very distinct violations of common law, specified in several statutes bearing on the accessories of crime.

First, When the priest is made the confidant of an intended crime, which the seal of the Confessional forbids

him to disclose, he becomes an "accessory before the fact."

Second, When the priest is made the confidant of a perpetrated crime, with the like provision of concealment, he becomes an "accessory after the fact."

Third, When the priest becomes the recipient of stolen property, under the pretext of becoming the channel of restitution to the party defrauded, he distinctly becomes, in the view of the law, *particeps criminis*—a participator in the robbery.

Fourth, When the priest, having become acquainted either with intended or perpetrated crime, or becomes possessed of stolen property for the avowed purpose of restitution, refuses to give evidence in civil courts, under the pretext of the seal or secrecy required by the rule of the Confessional.

An illustrative reference to the *first* of these cases is supplied by the Rev. L. J. Nolan, in the well-known pamphlet published by this converted priest in 1838, and in which he says—

"During the last three years I discharged the duty of a Romish clergyman, my heart often shuddered at the idea of entering the Confessional. The thought of the many crimes I had to hear, the growing doubt upon my mind that Confession was an erroneous doctrine, that it tended more to harden than reclaim the heart, and that through it I should be rendered instrumental in ministering destruction to souls, were awful considerations to me in the hours of reflection. The recital of the murderous acts I had often heard through the iniquitous tribunal had cost me many a restless night, and is still fixed with horror in my memory. But the most awful of all considerations is this, that through the Confessional I had been frequently apprised of *intended assassinations*, and *most diabolical conspiracies*; and still, from the ungodly injunctions of secrecy in the Romish creed, lest, as Peter Dens says, 'the Confessional should become odious,' I dared not give the slightest intimation to the marked out victims of slaughter. But though my heart now trembles at the recollection of the murderous acts, still duty obliges me to proceed and enumerate one or two instances of the cases alluded to."

He then goes on to mention the instances, and in so doing he supplies an explanation, much needed, in connection with

the confession of *intended sins*. Romish theology would lead us to believe that the Confessional is only allowed to take cognisance of sins incurred by their commission, but the teaching of history in reference to such transactions as the Gunpowder Plot, and these cases enumerated by Mr Nolan, make it evident that the priest not only hears and pardons perpetrated, but premeditated crimes. Mr Nolan explains the confession of intended sins on a principle which does not at all supply a satisfactory motive. He says, in reference to one of the cases he enumerates—

“The penitent’s only reason for having disclosed the awful machination to his confessor seems to have originated from a hope that his wicked design would be *hallowed by his previous acknowledgment of it to his priest*.”

Doubtless Mr Nolan himself was never personally concerned in the wicked act of professing to pardon future sin, but the explanation he offers does not by any means remove the impression that criminals have both confessed and received absolution for intended as well as accomplished crime.

Secondly, The priest, by concealing and pardoning perpetrated crime, becomes an accessory after the fact. Nothing is more calculated to frustrate the ends of human justice than an accomplice in the secrecy of crime, who can not only give such counsel as may enable the culprit to evade the law, as in the late Glasgow case, associating the illegal confessional procedure of Priest M’Laughlan, (further noticed below,) but who can actually pardon the crime *before human justice is satisfied*, and thus divert the power of civil justice from its salutary effects in relation to social morality. The testimony of the Rev. J. Burnett, (*Evidence before the Lords’ Committee*, p. 240,) shows the effect of Confessional absolution upon the minds of Irish convicted criminals, in these words—

“The confidence of the people in their absolution which follows confession is such as completely to destroy in their minds any fear of future punishment. I have found this to be the case generally; and in cases where *they are convicted in courts of justice* they very

seldom show anything like a feeling sense of their situation, which, I conceive, arises solely from a conviction that the absolution enjoyed at the hands of the priest will do everything for them. I have seen myself thirty-five individuals in the dock together sentenced to death, and I could not perceive the least degree of emotion in consequence of the pronouncing of the sentence, all of which I attributed to the confidence placed in the absolution of the clergy."

The *third* case in which, in the eye of the law, the priest becomes an accessory or participator in crime, results from the doctrine or discipline of the Papacy in reference to the restitution or restoration of property. According to this doctrine or discipline, no fraudulent penitent is bound to return stolen property to the party defrauded. The Church constitutes the priest the canonical receiver of stolen goods, and commissions *him* to make the restitution — a case illustrated some time ago in a trial at Durham, in which William Kay was indicted for the highway robbery of a watch, the Rev. John Kelly having received the same in the Confessional, and made himself the medium of restitution.

"In the course of the case (says the *Times*' report) the Rev. John Kelly, a Roman Catholic priest, who gave a watch, part of the stolen property, to a policeman the day after the robbery, was called for the prosecution. After the oath had been administered to him by the crier, he refused to kiss the book. He stated that he was willing to swear that he would tell the truth, and nothing but the truth, but objected to state the whole truth, the watch having come into his possession in the course of his exercise of the duties of the Confessional. The learned judge (Justice Hill) stated, that the law protected Mr Kelly from criminating himself in any way, and that he would see him protected; but that the law would not protect a clergyman of any persuasion who chose to receive property, the produce of a felony immediately after the offence had been committed, from disclosing from whom such property had been received." — *Times*, Wednesday, March 7, 1860.

The priest on this occasion was committed for refusing to give evidence; but the court, in this and similar cases, is wont to overlook the priestly violation of the law by becoming a self-constituted receiver of stolen goods. This violation is, of course, indulged on the principle that the priest receives the stolen property with the view to restore

it to the rightful owner. An *honest* priest will certainly perform this part; but the law receives no security whatever for the priest's honesty; and the secrecy connected with the Confessional enables any dishonest priest to retain, instead of restoring property committed to his care for restitution. That the Confessional *is* made the medium of this kind of robbery, is divulged to us by the testimony of Romish priests themselves. In Liguori's *Praxis of the Confessional*, we have this singular admonition on stealing to pay masses :—

"It is wonderful, indeed, that there are so many confessors so ignorant, who, although they know who the creditor is, enjoin upon the penitent, *that of the stolen goods which they ought to restore, they bestow alms or have masses said.*"—Liguor. *Prax. Con.*, No. 44.

Thus we have, on the testimony of a master in Romish theology, that "many confessors," instead of causing their fraudulent penitents to make restitution, coolly appropriate the stolen property to their own use, under the pretext of receiving it either for alms or masses. Liguori naively enough attributes this abuse to *ignorance*; but if a priest is so ignorant as not to know that he here commits a most aggravated breach of the eighth commandment, by robbery for the alleged service of God, as well as a felony against the civil law, how is such an official qualified to discharge the duty of a censor of morals?

It is easy to see that the legal permission of an institution for the reception of stolen goods, in which the receiver is made no way responsible to the civil power, is one which must be employed to subvert the ends of civil justice, and make the subjects of the state liable to serious defalcations, through the facilities and opportunities which are thus afforded to the cupidity of an unprincipled priesthood.

The *fourth* case, or the Confessional discipline which requires the priest to brave the civil law, by refusing to give legal testimony, on the plea of the Confessional obligation called "the Seal," is not only an infringement of legitimate and necessary civil authority, but one fraught with numerous evil consequences to social morality. The case of Priest

M'Laughlan, of Eastmuir, near Glasgow, is in the memory of most people as one which gave rise to a series of trials, in which the priest refused to give the necessary evidence for the conviction of Terence M'Ghee. In one of the early trials—11th December 1862—Mr M'Laughlan was sentenced by a Justice of Peace to a period of imprisonment for refusing to give evidence; and in the last trial in the High Court of Justiciary—Saturday, 10th January 1863—the priest succeeded in shortening his sentence to the fourteen days of his imprisonment which had then expired.

The whole case was so important, as revealing the lawless attitude of the Papacy, that it created a large amount of newspaper comment and correspondence, of which a few extracts are subjoined, to explain the origin and bearings of the case:—

“The pretension, on the part of the Romish priesthood, to override or ignore the ordinary provisions of civil law, is still found continuing, reappearing with identically the same character, though in a modified form. We have frequently had occasion to call attention to *its bearing on legal proceedings and civil rights in our own country.*

“The proceedings in the Glasgow Justice of Peace Court on Thursday formed so characteristic an illustration of the priestly theory of exemption from ordinary civil responsibilities, that they ought not to be allowed to pass uncommented on. Then and there a Roman Catholic priest was committed to prison for the term of one month for contempt of court, in consequence of his having refused to give the necessary evidence respecting the consignment of a letter to the prisoner whose case was under consideration. . . .

“It must be presumed that Mr M'Laughlan, in refusing to give his evidence, acted from a strict and conscientious sense of duty; but the result of his refusal was simply to *defeat the execution of the laws of the land.* It had the effect, as the priest was told in court, of erecting himself into a species of sanctuary to which criminals might turn their steps, in the belief that they might safely divulge the crimes they had committed, and *get his assistance in aiding them either to conceal the crime or to evade the penalty.*”—From the *Morning Post*, as quoted in *Is a R. C. Clergyman superior to the Civil Magistrate?* Glasgow, 1863.

“The principle which the law of England embodies is, that a public duty must override a private one; and that as every man must be held to know the law, the confession must be regarded as having been given and received, *subject to the higher obligation to*

reveal it at the bidding of the proper authority."—From the *Spectator*, in *Ibid.*

This excerpt furnishes the principle which should be distinctly enunciated in regard to Confessional practice. Were priests bound to make known to their penitents that, however they might rely on the seal of the Confessional, if the communications there made involve civil or criminal interests requiring the cognisance of the magistrate, they must be revealed, a large amount of the crime now committed would be avoided.

"Though the law of this country in principle does not recognise the confidence subsisting between ministers of religion and criminal members of their flocks, yet in practice a great amount of toleration has been shown, and will be shown, to the secrecy of the confessions made to clergymen, whether in the Romish Confessional or the Protestant Vestry. But it is only as spiritual intermediaries, or, as they themselves term it, as ghostly advisers, that such a privilege can be extended to clergymen. Our spiritual confessor, on learning a criminal secret, must not pull on his top-coat and go bustling about on *terra-firma* to conceal the traces of the crime, or put the officers of justice on a wrong scent, and so screen the offender. This is a kind of ghost which it would be extremely dangerous to harbour on the soil. It does not appear to be sufficiently understood that it is in having substantially acted thus that the gravamen of the charge against Father M'Lauchlan consists."—*Morning Journal*, in *Ibid.*

Letter addressed to the Editor of the "Daily Review."

"SIR,—I perceive by the *Daily Review* of yesterday that Priest Patrick M'Laughlan, of Eastmuir, Glasgow, has been subjected to the penalty of imprisonment for refusing to give evidence in the Justice of Peace Court in the case of Ferguson against M'Ghee. As the *Review* has explained the origin and character of the case, I need not enter into particulars touching the parties or the occurrences originating a trial which has so important a bearing upon the relations of Popery to the civil institutions of this country.

"The priest's committal to prison will doubtless raise a clamorous cry of religious persecution among the Romish population of Glasgow and elsewhere; and liberal Protestants—that is, Protestants affected with apathy and ignorance in relation to the principles of the Papacy—will be found uttering expressions of spurious sympathy in behalf of the reverend victim who has so flagrantly insulted the law of this land.

"Protestants of the class referred to lie under the mistaken apprehension that Rome is a mere religion—a principle of conscience

between God and man, with which no legal functionary has a right to interfere by coercive means. The case of Priest M'Laughlan is happily calculated to correct this blunder, by exposing the obstructive bearing of Popery upon the legitimate action of our civil and criminal law, and the utter impossibility of harmonising the unrestrained exercise of Romish principles and Romish practice with the due exercise of the functions proper to the office of the civil magistrate.

"I shall not trespass on your space by referring to other dogmas illustrative of this remark, but simply confine myself to the institution of the *Confessional*—that which has been so prominently brought before the public by the case of Ferguson against M'Ghee, and the evidence withheld in the case by the priest's refusal to swear the legally required oath.

"Neither shall I dwell upon the Confessional as a source of immorality, and other abuses affecting the social relations of human communities. My intention is simply to offer a few remarks on the Confessional, as it *invades the rights of the civil magistrate*, and the due exercise of those criminal laws of which he is the appointed dispenser.

"The criminal law, we are thankful to know, is based; in our country, upon the Second Table of the Divine Code, and hence the Confessional involves principles no less antagonistic to the scriptural rule than to the civil enactments which have that rule for its basis. We are thus led, in the first instance, to briefly review the proposed aspect of the Confessional in the light of the sacred page.

"It is in accordance with the clearest teaching of this authority that restitution—the matter upon which the priest refused his evidence—is to be made neither to nor through a third party, but directly by the defaulter to the party injured. The divine rule says (Matt. v. 23, 24)—'If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.' That is, accommodating the rule to our New Testament dispensation, if we are about to engage in any religious exercise or ordinance with a view to conciliate or obtain the divine approval, that religious exercise can only be acceptably engaged by *first* adopting the means necessary to reconcile us to such individuals as we may have injured in person or property. Granting for a moment that Auricular Confession, with its concurring Contrition and Satisfaction, is a scriptural form for seeking reconciliation with God, it is plain that any fraud or fault committed by the penitent, and by which he is rendered sensible that 'his brother has aught against him,' must not only involve the duty of personal restitution to the party injured, but this duty must be performed *before* the penitent can acceptably

approach the Confessional. The command is—'*first* be reconciled to thy brother'—*then* come and offer thy gift, or the spiritual sacrifice in the case. Popery, being essentially *anti-Christianity*, in this case as in every other, reverses the divine institution, and not only transposes the steps in the order of duty, but innovates a priestly medium utterly destructive of the divine intent in the precept of restitution. Thus, in the Confessional system, the restitution, instead of being made first, is made last, if made at all; and not only is it made out of its place, but being made through the unscriptural intervention of a third party—the priest—some of the most important and salutary objects of restitution, which cannot be detailed without trespassing on too much of your space, are effectually frustrated.

"But not to dwell further upon the Scripture violations involved in the Confessional practice of Rome, allow me to refer to this practice as it invades the principles of civil and criminal law affecting the rights of property. To receive stolen property, *knowing it to be stolen*, is a manifest breach of our criminal code. The letter of the law, its dignity and authority, are even in this one particular set aside in subjection to the teaching of the foreign potentate that rules in Britain as well as at Rome, and that has made his priests the official receivers of stolen property throughout Her Majesty's dominions.

"The priest's office in this case not only intercepts the law in relation to the crime of others, but puts him in a position in which he may become a criminal himself with the utmost degree of impunity from the law of the State. Priests are but men, and history, even as written by Roman Catholics themselves, has abundantly revealed to us that a priest may be just as dishonest, as unprincipled a rogue, as the penitent has been who makes restitution through his hands. Hence the property with which he has been thus intrusted may be appropriated, and doubtless has often been appropriated, to his own use instead of being delivered to the party defrauded. In such a case of delinquency, what is called 'the Seal, or official secrecy of the Confessional,' secures the priest from all possible exposure, and from all possible responsibility to law. The rule of 'the Seal' is, that whatever transpires in the Confessional can never be divulged out of the Confessional by *either* priest or penitent, under pain of mortal sin, and consequent eternal damnation. Here, therefore, a dishonest priest is fully secured against the civil consequences of any fraud he may choose to commit in the appropriation of restitution property. The Confessional makes a provision by which the criminal law as affecting his person is to him a dead letter. It is needless here to refer to the constant temptation to crime which such a privileged security from consequences must excite in the mind of every unprincipled priest.

"But the late trial has divulged an additional feature in priestly privilege. It appears by this revelation that a Romish priest is not only bound to conceal roguery and crime divulged in the Confessional, but such as may come to his knowledge even *out of the Confessional*. I quote two of the priest's answers to questions put by the Assessor, in the report of the trial furnished by the *North British Daily Mail* of the 9th inst. :—

"*Assessor*—You, as a clergyman, may acquire a knowledge of any particular thing out of the Confessional—would you speak to that knowledge?

"*Priest*—I will make a case. Supposing a clergyman knows about a thing *even out of the Confessional*, but which he could not know unless he were a clergyman, then I say that, in conscience, he would be bound not to reveal that. . . .

"*Assessor*—You are taking a very high and broad view of your privilege. There are many cases where a clergyman, out of the Confessional, comes to the knowledge of facts. Whatever is revealed to you under the seal of the Confessional you are not bound to reveal; but suppose a man came and told you he was guilty of a crime, you would be bound to tell that?

"*Priest*—My case is this. Where a priest knows a thing only as a priest, in his official capacity, *even though not in the Confessional*, he must not reveal it.'

"This trial, therefore, has thrown important light upon the priest's privilege to evade the object and the executive powers of the civil and criminal laws of this realm. He can conceal all manner of crime, when he chooses to regard his person as existing in its official capacity, whether in or out of the Confessional! Truly, the Assessor remarked, 'You are taking a very high and broad view of your privilege.'

"Now, what is this official position by which the priest professes a right to his high prerogatives? It is, according to the undisguised teaching of the Romish Church, no less than the *position of God himself*. In relation to this position, the *Review* has supplied its readers with a quotation from Mascardus, which we requote for the benefit of such as may not have seen its article of the 10th inst. :—'*Quod scit, scit ut Deus, et ut Deus non producitur sed ut homo, et tanquam homo ignorat illud super quo producitur.*' That is—'What he (the priest) knows, he knows *as God*; and as confession is made to him not as man but as God, also *as man* he is ignorant as regards what is confessed.'

"The intolerable blasphemy which impregnates this verbal deliverance betokens its production by a more than ordinary blast of that afflatus from beneath which inspires the prophets of Rome—a blasphemy further enhanced by the awful slander which the doctrine expressed puts upon the divine character. The priest

assumes his right to conceal sin and cushion crime, because he acts in the position of God. But where has God personally acted on the priest's principles? The most favoured saints whose biographies are recorded by the pen of inspiration have had their most secret sins exposed by God himself, and with unsparing severity. But the enormities of the Confessional office are to be further seen in the further quotation which we subjoin from Dens' Theology—another casuist of high renown.

“What, therefore, ought a confessor to answer, being interrogated concerning the truth which he has known through sacramental confession?

“‘He ought to answer that he does not know it, and, *if necessary, confirm the same by an oath.*’

“Thus the grand seal of human veracity—that upon which the security of all legal findings in this country depends—a Christian oath—is set aside as non-obligatory by the higher seal of the Romish Confessional! A denial on oath, however, is known to the priest to be rather a perilous practice in our civil courts, where the cross-examination and the sifting of evidence all but certainly discovers a perjurious witness, and renders him liable to serious consequences. Hence the priest does not often venture to avail himself of the privilege allowed him by Dens' Theology, and Priest M'Laughlan wisely preferred *not* to swear, when he knew the probable consequences of swearing falsely.

“We rejoice in the trial which has given practical illustration of this teaching. It should awaken the apathy and indifference which prevails among Protestants in relation to the civil and social evils of Popery, and encourage the exercise of gratitude to those in our land who have continued to lift up the voice of testimony against the alarming spread of Papal errors.—I am, &c.,

“A CONTROVERSIAL MISSIONARY.

“13th December 1862.”

The latest conspicuous case in reference to the seal of the Confessional has occurred in connection with Constance Kent and the “Road Murder,” and shows that the Popish mimics, who are receiving Protestant pay for Romanising the Church of England, are quite as willing to brave the law as the patterns which they are seeking to rival.

At the proceedings in the Magistrates' Court at Trowbridge, held on Thursday, 4th May 1865, the Rev. A. D. Wagner, Puseyite minister, being examined, addressed the magistrate in these terms:—

“Allow me to say, that I shall decline to divulge anything which may criminate Miss Kent, which has passed in Confession.”

Quite in the same spirit, Miss Catherine Anne Green, who called herself "Lady Superior" of St Mary's Hospital, 2 Queen's Square, Brighton, refused to give evidence in the case, on the plea of a new relationship which seeks to adopt the obligations of "the Seal." When called to give evidence, this "Superior Lady" at once signified her intended reticence in these terms :—

"I desire to say, that from the first time that the prisoner came to reside at the Home, I stood in the position of a mother to her, and she as a daughter to me. I therefore wish to ask you not to press me with *questions which would tend to divulge the confidence that exists between mother and daughter.*"

In the history of this case we have an illustration of the power of conscience over all human attempts to silence this monitor. Constance Kent tried to stifle its power by confession, made both to the "Lady Superior" and the self-constituted confessor, the Rev. A. D. Wagner. They industriously tried to persuade the criminal that such a confession was religiously sufficient, but conscience continued to reply, No! Contrary, therefore, to the united persuasion of her spiritual advisers, Father Wagner and Mother Green, the girl Constance determined to perform the only act which could bring her peace—to give herself up to public justice, and to make that public confession of her crime which society demanded.

Confessional Directorship.

The office of Confessional Director (we should call it *dictator*,) is a development from the office of simple confessor, and as it has received a distinct recognition and title in the Church, it requires a distinct notice. The office of directorship signifies that power which the *habitual* confessor is allowed to possess or assume in relation to the whole conduct of any individual confessed. The absolute character of the director's power may be learned by the following reference from "Den's Theology" :—

"If any one being concerned about his salvation shall doubt and often interrogate others—also if he shall be disquieted with various thoughts about his faith, chastity, and other virtues, against which

at the same time, even when occasion is given, he is unwilling to offend, &c.—it may thence be collected that he is a man labouring under a scrupulous conscience.”

Here is the disease ; next he prescribes the remedy :—

“With regard to the general remedies, the first is *an humble and blind obedience to the confessor or director of his soul without examination of reasons or arguments* ; and this remedy is of such necessity and efficacy that without it none other will avail !”—Vol. i. pp. 414–417.

But it must not be supposed that the office of director is limited to spiritual concerns. As already intimated, it embraces the control of the whole conduct, more especially when the party directed is the female head of a domestic establishment, with whom the priest's progress to the office of director is thus described by Michelet :—

“The habitual confessor is now her *director*. This is a great and important change. As her confessor he received her at church at certain stated hours ; as her director he sees her at his own hours, at her house, occasionally at his. As her confessor he was generally passive ; he listened a great deal and spoke but little. If he prescribed, it was done in a few words. As her director he is ever on the alert ; not only rules her actions, but what is infinitely more important, he influences her thoughts by intimate conversation. To the confessor she tells her sins and nothing more. To the director she confides everything both as regards herself and her family, her affairs and her interests. How is it possible to withhold from one to whom she has intrusted her eternal salvation such petty temporal concerns as the marriage of her children, the will she intends to make,” &c.

Such is the power which the office of director confers on the priest, in reference to individuals and families—power which permeates society at large, which extends from private to public interests, or from personal, family, and social relations to the

Political Applications of the Confessional.

Every government, like every individual, acting on worldly principles, and in his own sphere, will conduct its home, but more especially its foreign policy, and regulate its diplomatic intercourse on the principle of self-interest. In such a rivalry for self-advantage, nothing can tend or

contribute more to a successful policy, on the part of any government, than a knowledge of the state secrets, the powers, purposes, and so on, of other governments with whom treaties or other political measures are being negotiated. The game of politics is like a game at cards. An unprincipled player, who succeeds in gaining a knowledge of his opponent's "hand," has always a likelihood of winning. That the Pope has played his card under some such advantage is evident from the history of the Papacy, and the singular success by which he has piloted his barque through the political storms of a thousand years. Some will be disposed to attribute this successful career solely to the religious element which blends with the constitution of the Papacy, and gives it that vitality and coherency wanting in other governments. But Roman Catholics themselves are disposed to take a sounder view of the case, and to ascribe the political success of the Papacy to the superior adroitness of its political tactics. A present day controversialist of some standing and authority in his church, writing on Supremacy, and believing he was bespattering the Pope with praise, thus expresses himself upon the Pope's ability and success as a diplomatic tactician :—

"The Roman Court (the title of the Pope's *political* government is the Court of Rome) does not require our feeble advocacy, for it can take care of itself. Its wisdom and caution are proverbial—immeasurably greater than what we pique ourselves upon in Scotland. *Roma mora* has passed into an aphorism. The other European courts are not slow in awarding the praise of *the most profound sagacity, and unequalled statesmanship to the Court of Rome*. The Russian Ambassador, Italinsky, observed that 'Rome is invulnerable in her dogmas, and that it is the only court in which *no complete blunder in politics is ever made*.'

"It would be tedious," continues Mr M'Corry, "to refer to other testimonies, but we may remark, while on this subject, that at the Congress of Vienna, in which were assembled representatives from the various courts, to settle the affairs of Europe, Cardinal Consalvi, the Papal nuncio, was the master-mind present. *Even politically speaking*, then, the Court of Rome has always stood eminently conspicuous, nor is there any danger of its lapsing from its high and well-established character in the diplomatic world."—*The Supremacy*

of St Peter. By the Rev. J. S. M'Corry, M.A.P. Edinburgh, 1852. P. 164.

We are told that the children of this world are wiser (that is, in worldly policy) than the children of light. The truly religious character is not calculated to play a successful part in a field where the battle is usually fought with the weapons of duplicity and carnal wisdom. But Mr M'Corry believes it greatly to the credit of the Pope to play the part and exhibit the skill of an ecclesiastical Tallyrand in the battle of politics. That the Pope has played his part with the utmost success is not disputed, but that the cause has been the mere possession of superior political skill is by no means conceded, while we have so obvious a clue to the means of success afforded by the powers of the Confessional. With this engine to ply on his behalf, the Pope's ability to rival all competitors in the game of diplomacy is natural and obvious. This power in the social sphere which the individual priest acquires from a knowledge of individual or family secrets, the Pope in the political world derives from a knowledge of state counsels; and that such a knowledge is freely acquired and exercised by the Pope's government is obvious, both from the principles of the Papacy and the practical evidences which are found in the history of the Popedom.

The application of the Confessional, as a means of promoting the political intrigues of the Papacy, has long been the chief means by which the Pope has succeeded in maintaining his temporal throne. During the observance of Lent, the Papacy periodically commissions a number of preachers to visit the various towns of the Ecclesiastical States, who act as a species of circuit confessors for their respective bishops.

"The course of sermons for Lent being concluded, the preacher presents himself to the bishop, to give an account of the town in which he has been preaching; and he finds himself in a condition to report exactly the tendencies of the people, political and religious, as during his stay he has confessed almost the entire population—receiving confession being an integral part of his mission.

"The confessor, therefore, knows who are faithful to Pope and King, &c., and is able to repeat everything to the bishop. The

preacher is the *spy of the bishop*, and the bishop the *spy of the government*, so that confession is the most subtle engine of espionage."—See *Incidents in the Life of an Italian Priest*, by Luigi Blanchi.

Such is the testimony of one who was himself a frequent Confessional emissary, and whose valuable work, descriptive of the workings of Popery, has furnished the above extract.

Civil Obligations of the Confessional in the Papal States.

The Fourth Council of Lateran decrees,—

“That every man and woman, after they come to years of discretion, shall privately confess their sins to their own priest, at least once a year, and endeavour faithfully to perform the penance enjoined on them; and after this they shall come to the sacrament, at least at Easter, unless the priest, for some reasonable cause, judges it fit for them to abstain at that time; and whosoever does not conform to this rule is to be excommunicated from the church, and, if he die, he is to be refused Christian burial.”—Canon 21.

This rule, which is confirmed by the 8th canon of 14th Session of the Council of Trent, is imported into the civil constitution of the Pope's Italian territory, so that its fulfilment, being left in charge of the civil executive, every subject of the Pope is compelled to confess and receive absolution from his sins every year, whether he desires the pardon of his sins or not. In the gospel scheme we think it an amazing exhibition of mercy to provide us with gratuitous justification; but the vicar of Christ is far more merciful than the Master he assumes to represent,—he provides not only a gratuitous, but a compulsory pardon for all his subjects every year! The legislative regulations of the Pope for the enforced absolution of his children are by no means so fully appreciated as the value of the boon would imply. A few extracts will be sufficient to describe their operations:—

“If every true born Italian man, woman, and child, within the Pope's dominions, does not confess and receive the communion at least once a year before Easter, his *name is posted up in the parish church*; if he still refrain, he is exhorted, entreated, and otherwise tormented; and if he persist in his contumacy, he is excommunicated, which is a very good joke to us, (foreigners,) but none at all

to an Italian, since it involves *the loss of civil rights, and perhaps of liberty and property*.”—*Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, ii., p. 262.

“A friend of ours, (an Italian,) who has lived a great deal in foreign countries, and there imbibed very heterodox notions, and who has never to us made any secret of his confirmed unbelief of Catholicism, went to-day to confession with the strongest repugnance. ‘What can I do?’ he said. ‘If I neglect, I am reprimanded by the parish priest; if I delay it, my name is posted up in the parish church; if I persist in my contumacy, the arm of the Church will overtake me, and my rank and fortune only make me more obnoxious to its power. If I choose to make myself a martyr to infidelity, as the saints of old did to religion, and to suffer the extremity of punishment *in the loss of property and personal rights*, what is to become of my wife and family? The same ruin would overtake them though they are Catholics; for I am obliged not only to conceal my true belief, and profess what I despise, but I must bring up my children in their abominable idolatries and superstition, or, if I teach them the truth, make them either hypocrites or beggars.’

“I shall not enter into the soundness of my friend’s arguments, or defend the rectitude of his conduct: but certainly the alternative is a hard one, and I believe there are thousands whose virtue would not be proof against it.

“For this reason he would not live a day in Italy if he could live out of it, which is not in his power.”—*Ibid*, iii., p. 160.

Another author of high repute gives the following account:—

“At the Easter communion (in Rome) communion tickets are delivered by the *chierico*, (clerk), while the priest administers. The parish priest calls for the tickets at the houses during the following week. . . .

“On St Bartholomew’s Day, August 24, the names of the recusants in all the parishes of Rome were placarded in print on the church of that name, on the ‘Island’ in the Tiber. If this proceeding failed to terrify the parties, they were committed for a few days to an institution called the *Ospezo* of the *Ponte Rotto*. The immediate process of placarding the names in the Church of St Bartholomew has, so far as I can learn, ceased; but the committals to the *Ponte Rotto* continue.”—*The Romanism of Italy*, by Sir Culling Eardly, Bart.

It is not, however, so much in the home as the foreign policy of the Papacy that it finds its chief account in the political application of the Confessional. To facilitate the acquisition of foreign news, and especially diplomatic

secrets, through this channel, the Church of St Peter's is furnished with Confessional apartments for the individuals of the several nations in which the spiritual subjects of the Pope are found to reside, including Confessionals for Spanish, Portuguese, French, English, German, Hungarian, Dutch, Swedish, Greek, and Armenian Papists. With such a Polyglot corps of confessors at home, all in organised communication and accord with a corresponding Confessional agency in almost every foreign state, the Papacy has always been enabled to keep itself so informed of the political movements and designs of foreign courts as to enable it to influence and even control the actings of almost every government in Europe.

In making ourselves acquainted with the individual, social, and political influence of the Confessional, we must ever recollect that the Confessional is a *directorship* in relation to the conduct of the penitent. It is not merely by the acquisition of personal, social, or political secrets that the Confessional supplies the priest with personal, family, or political influence. It is the opportunity which this ordinance affords to the confessor of using *persuasion and counsel, and often commands and threats*, all made efficacious by an appeal to spiritual interests, which makes the Confessional such an instrument of power in advancing the temporal policy and wealth of his Church! The page of history alone can furnish us with evidence of the political power which the Papacy was enabled to exercise by the Confessional dictators, who seek to reduce the world to the Pope's authority. As a matter of course, Confessional counsel, or rather dictation, will be politically effective, in proportion as the priest can succeed in bringing his influence to bear upon the centres and summit of political authority. To reach and control the power of the throne has always been the grand aim of the Papacy in every country and to this end a special office was inaugurated, called

The King's Confessor.

A few historical references will be useful to explain the origin and influence of the office :—

"The title of Kingly Confessor was unknown in the time of Charlemagne, and even during the reign of several of his successors; for kings did not then confess, and their subjects imitated generally their example. This practice was confined to the convents. We find, however, that this palatial function existed in 947. Later, that is to say at the period when confession had become sacramental, kings *had titled confessors*. . . .

"This duty having become important, from the influence of credit and power of those who performed it, was coveted equally by the secular and regular clergy; but the latter obtained exclusive possession of the post. The Benedictines were the first; then came the Franciscans and other mendicant friars, who were succeeded by the Dominicans; lastly the Jesuits, more artful, and under the interested protection of the Popes, supplanted all their rivals, and remained masters of the field down to the period of their destruction."—Lasteyrie's *Auricular Confession*, vol. ii., pp. 176, 177.

"All who are acquainted with history (says Dulauri) are convinced that the confessors of the Court served Cardinal Richelieu not only as spies, but that they were the instruments most commonly employed by that cardinal to *direct the opinions of eminent persons*.

"Sire, (says an adviser of Louis XIII.,) the public earnestly wish that your majesty would in this matter be pleased to imitate the wisdom of the Popes and the prudence of the King of Spain, who certainly make use of these good fathers as *spies*, in order to discover by their interference the secrets of others; but they take good care not to declare their own to them, in order not to be dependent on them, or to enable them to play double. For this reason, no Jesuit hitherto has had the honour of confessing their majesties or the infants and infantas. . . .

"Your majesty ought to take example from this, sire, and consider the inconveniences into which France has fallen, and into which your majesty may likewise fall, by making the confessors of the Louvre hereditary in the family of the Jesuits, as in the Empire in the house of Austria."—*La Voix Publique au Roi*, 1624, p. 22.

"All judicious persons of the Catholic communion" (says Hume) "were disgusted with the violent measures, and could easily foresee the consequences. But James was entirely governed by the rash counsels of the Queen and his confessor, Father Peters, a Jesuit, whom he soon after created a privy counsellor."—*History of England*, anno 1686.

"The confessor of a sovereign has the means of inflicting misery on millions. In Arragon a law was passed to prevent the king selecting his own confessor, and vesting the election in the Cortes. By refusing to give absolution to a monarch till his commands are obeyed, the priest is able to procure the adoption or execution of the most persecuting laws; and many a martyr's fire has blazed, and

many a deed of cruelty has been perpetrated, to make satisfaction for royal transgressions, and to induce the unyielding confessor to absolve his sceptred slave.

"The tribunal of the Confessional is more authoritative than the tribunal of the magistrate.

"The dictum of the confessor is more influential than the decision of recognised law. The spiritual overrides the secular,—the arbitrary supersedes the constitutional.

'The secret springs that move the body politic all centre in the Confessional, and are directed as the caprice of the confessor or the emergencies of the Church require; and the miserable results of this centralised ecclesiastical domination is written in the social, the intellectual, and physical aspects of the countries in which it prevails.'—Pike's *Popery Exposed*, p. 144.

These remarks of the last quotation bring before us the special influence which pertains to

The Act of Absolution.

Absolution is a term embracing several varieties of signification in the Papal and other corrupt systems of theology. The following different kinds of absolution are referred to and explained in Eadie's Theological Dictionary:—Sacramental Absolution, which includes Baptismal and Penitential Absolution; Declaratory Absolution; Precatory or Deprecatory Absolution; Judicial Absolution.

So many varieties of meaning in the term is simply the result of a corresponding variety of changes in the "development" or progressive formation of the doctrine. At first, sin was held to be remitted only by the sacrament of baptism; then in addition by the ordeal of penance; then by a deprecatory form, or form of prayer, in which the priest supplicated for the remission of the penitent's sin. Next came the declaratory delivery, in which the priest pronounced the forgiveness of sin *by God* to such as had the necessary disposition for pardon; and, lastly, the declaratory form was changed into the *judicial* formula and act, in which the *priest himself* assumes the power of remitting or retaining sin at the option of his own will; so THAT, IF THE PRIEST DETERMINES THE REMISSION OF SIN, GOD HIMSELF CANNOT BUT JUSTIFY; AND IF THE PRIEST REFUSES TO PARDON, GOD HIMSELF CANNOT FORGIVE. The belief in

such a power as an attribute of priesthood, naturally produced the most abject subjection of the whole man to the authority of the confessor. Just in proportion as Popery is enabled to propagate faith in this judicial absolution are the priests made masters of the persons and property of their spiritual vassals.

Absolution is the very climax of that progressive usurpation by which the preacher became a priest, the priest a judge, and the judge a God, and master over the whole system of society and individual human life.

The revealments of the Confessional are not more serviceable to the priest, in the pursuit of power and pelf, than the accompanying Act of Absolution; the one is *knowledge*, the other is *power*; the one enables the priest to form his plans, the other invests him with the necessary executive force; the one leads him to the discovery of a treasure, but the other carries the hand into the purse. Hence the absolving power affords the most commanding influence in enabling the priest to subvert the provisions of civil law and control the authority of civil officials. This power of "the keys" is brought to bear with peculiar force upon the *dying*. The merest threat to withhold absolution without due munificence for past sins, is sufficient to produce an ample legacy for ecclesiastical purposes.

"What else has reared so many monasteries, with their lumbering, dronish, often vicious inmates? What else has transferred a fourth part of the lands of some countries to the Church? Allow some influence to misguided piety and perverted benevolence, yet have Confession and the *viaticum* been the main instruments in this ghostly traffic; and the indignant eloquence of Father Gavazzi strikes the true chord when he denounces testamentary freebooters and pious privateers, and mourns over the patrimony of orphans, *swindled from its lawful heirs by the conveyances of the Confessional or of the dying pillow.*"

Thus the joint influence of Confession and Absolution are not only made available to the purpose of pecuniary extortion, but testamentary obligations of every character are made to conform to the wishes of the priest and the good of the Church.

Take the following specimen from a present day valuable expositor of Romish principles :—

“A case has lately been tried in the courts of Dublin, which very strikingly illustrates the true anti-social nature of the Roman system. A Popish man marries a Protestant wife, and, as he is not very zealous, the children are sent to a Protestant school. By and by the man is on his death-bed, and sends for the priest. The priest not only denounces him for allowing his children to be trained as Protestants, but insists on his subscribing a will, virtually excluding his wife from the guardianship of her children, as the *condition of granting him absolution*. The validity of this will is disputed, and the judge, although a Papist, strongly denounces it. But out of twelve jurors four are Romanists, and two of them refuse on any account to find the priest wrong. *The course of justice is entirely defeated!*”—*Bulwark*, Jan. 1, 1864, p. 180.

Reserved Absolutions.

In order to exalt the importance of the Confessional and enhance the value of the absolving power, the canon law restricts absolution by ordinary priests to sins of a certain class or degree of turpitude. Those sins which are ranked by the canon law as high in the scale of criminality, must be reserved to the tribunal of the bishop; such as are still more flagrant, to the archbishop; and some sins, particularly those of heresy, can only receive remission at the jurisdiction of the Pope himself.

The Council of Trent thus legislates on the point :—

“The Supreme Pontiffs, deservedly exercising the sovereign power which is given them over the universal Church, have been accustomed to *reserve to their own decision* the more weighty causes and crimes. Nor seeing that, in the Divine government, [that is, the Pope’s,] all things are well ordered, is it to be questioned that similar power (given for edification, not for destruction) belongs to all bishops in their respective dioceses, according to the authority invested in them over inferior priests, especially with regard to those offences to which the censure of excommunication is annexed.”—*Council of Trent*, sess. 14, chap. 7.

It is worthy of remark, that these reserved cases are almost always of a *political* character, or else refer to heretical opinions affecting *the authority of the Pope*. Thus, while real crimes of the most aggravated type are pardonable by the absolution of any ordinary priest, any

act bearing upon the secular interest of the Church or the prerogative of the Pope, is sure to come under the discipline of "reserved cases."

In cases reserved to the Pope's personal jurisdiction, this discipline commonly includes some previous condemnatory process issuing from the so-called Holy See, as Excommunication, Suspension, Interdict, &c., from which offenders in the case can only be released by Papal absolution. It were easy to cull numerous examples from history illustrative of the Pope's power in absolving offenders from the Papal censures with which they had been smitten.

In the year 1077, Henry IV. of Germany, having fallen into political collision with Gregory VII., was compelled to seek absolution in the most abject manner from the offended Pontiff.

In the year 1143 the Ambassadors of the King of France were commissioned to Pope Celestine II. to seek absolution for the king from an ecclesiastical censure. The Pope, after affecting much reluctance, appointed a set day for the occasion, when, seated on his pontifical throne, surrounded by a courtly throng, he pompously administered the solicited absolution by a significant motion of a cross.

The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, having been excommunicated by Pope Alexander III., and being disposed to attribute his defeat in a battle fought with the Milanese in 1177 to the Pope's canonical visitation, in a similar manner sued for, and with difficulty obtained, absolution in the Church of St Mark, Venice.

Such degradation of continental princes and political rulers might be multiplied; but no country ever endured a greater amount of similar political degradation at the hand of the Papacy than England herself in the reign of Queen Mary, when the whole Government, including both Houses of Parliament, basely consented to receive public Papal absolution for the political sins incurred in the two previous reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. The event affords Cobbet an acceptable opportunity to degrade both his country and his religion in these words :—

“On the 29th of November (1554), the two Houses petitioned the King and Queen. In this petition they expressed their deep regret at having been guilty of defection from the Church, and prayed their majesties, who had not participated in the sin, to intercede with the Holy Father the Pope, for their forgiveness, and for their readmission into the fold of Christ. The next day the Queen being seated on the throne, having the King on her left, and Pole, the Pope's Legate, on her right, the Lord High Chancellor, Bishop Gardiner, read the petition; the King and Queen then spoke to Pole, and he, at the close of a long speech, *gave, in the name of the Pope, to the two Houses of Parliament and the whole nation absolution, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; at which words the members of the two Houses, being on their knees, made the hall resound with Amen.*”

The Penitentiaries.

It is one of the misfortunes of the Papacy that its canonical legislation grows too fast for its executive capacities. Thus it was that the canon law, so multiplied, reserved cases that neither the bishops nor the Pope could manage to attend to the amount of business referred to their respective absolving faculties. Hence the Pope was obliged to create special absolving officers, called *Penitentiaries*. The Penitentiary officiating for the Pope at Rome is called the *Major Penitentiarius*, and to him is committed the power to absolve nearly all the cases reserved to the personal jurisdiction of the Pope, as well as to appoint local penitentiaries in foreign countries, with his own powers delegated for reserved absolutions. The office of the penitentiaries, however, is not limited to absolution from sins, but extends to obligations incurred by oaths, vows, or other engagements; from all which his sentence can absolve the contracting parties. The following is a brief notice of this office, furnished by an able pen, writing from Ireland:—

“The Major Penitentiarius is one of the Cardinals at Rome, who is invested by the Pope with the plenary power of granting dispensations and absolutions, by which (as the concession of them forms a considerable portion of that traffic in which, with feigned words, they make ‘merchandise of the souls of men’) the Pope's time would necessarily be grievously intruded on if he had not some person to whom this office was to be delegated. This Major Penitentiarius again would have his hands much too full of business if

the sale of all the souls in Europe, who barter their sins for money, were to be conducted by him. He is, therefore, in turn obliged to delegate his office to others, and accordingly he has a deputy at least in every diocese in Ireland; and when we consider the powers that are vested in these deputies, we need not wonder that outlawry and murder are matters of minor consideration.”—*M’Ghee’s Laws of the Papacy*, p. 204.

The Rev. Mr M’Ghee then refers to the Bull *Pastor Bonus*, for the rules which define and regulate the office of the Penitentiary, one of which is remarkable enough in according to the Penitentiary the power, not only to absolve murderers and others made outlaws by the civil government, but in providing for *their reception into various grades of the priesthood*.

“He, the Major Penitentiarius, can dispense, and order others to dispense, in either tribunal with homicides and outlaws, and other criminals, so that they may be lawfully received *into a religious order, and make profession of it, and so that even those who have committed murder may be able to enter any of the religious orders of clergymen, and become professors of it*, on this condition, however, when it shall appear befitting, that they shall have first satisfied the exchequer and the party.”—Bull *Pastor Bonus*, sec. 17.

PENANCES.

PENANCES (from which the sacrament of Penance derives its name) are the works of “satisfaction” which the priest imposes, and the penitent promises, as the condition of absolution. Penances, therefore, are simply the price which a Roman Catholic pays to God for his pardon, and the Confessional arrangement is such, that while the expressed imposition of the penances by the priest, and the expressed undertaking to perform them by the penitent takes place in the confession-box, the *actual performance* of the penances is wont to succeed, instead of precede, the act of absolution.

The priest appears to be allowed a discretionary power with regard both to the quality and quantity of works necessary to discharge the obligation called Satisfaction. The present day discipline of the Church is usually supposed to comprehend the various kinds of penitential satis-

faction under three kinds of punishment—prayer, fasting, and almsdeeds—leaving the priest to determine the *quantum sufficit, secundum artem*, or the sufficient quantity according to the rules of his art. It is quite characteristic of Popery to constitute prayer a penalty instead of a privilege. In former times, ere the Church of Rome was purified from its more scandalous corruptions by the rise and rivalry of the Reformation morality, all other penances might be cancelled for a pecuniary one, that is for so much paid to the Papal exchequer or the coffers of the priest. This discipline, according to Mosheim, had an obscure origin, but a very transparent object. The following is the remark of the historian, treating of the “History of the Teachers and Governors of the Church in the Eighth Century” :—

“The churches, monasteries, and bishops had before been well supplied with goods and revenues; but in this century there arose a new and most convenient method of acquiring for them far greater riches, and of amplifying them for ever. Suddenly—by whose instigation is not known—the idea became universally prevalent that the punishments for sin which God threatens to inflict may be bought off by liberal gifts to God, to the saints, to the temples, and to the ministers of God and of glorified saints. This opinion being everywhere admitted, the rich and prosperous, whose lives were now most flagitious, conferred their wealth (which they had received by inheritance or wrested from others by violence and war, according to the customs of the age) most bountifully upon the glorified saints, their ministers, and the guardians of their temples, for religious uses, in order to avoid the very irksome penances which were enjoined upon them by the priests, and yet be secure against the evils which threatened to overtake them after death. *This was the principal source of those immense treasures which from this century onward through all the subsequent ages flowed in upon the clergy, the churches, and the monasteries.*”—*Eccles. Hist.*, p. 267. Lond., 1864.

Development of the Penitential System.

Formerly all the parts of the now constituted sacrament called Penance were performed in public, because they had reference to public offences by which Church congregations became scandalised. These offences incurred *church censures*, and the contrition, confession, penances, and absolution had reference to the removal of these censures, without

the slightest pretension to any remission of the Divine penalty for sin. The public penances enjoined in this system of ecclesiastical discipline, being regulated by rule, were called *canonical* penances, and in this respect materially differ from the present *sacramental* penances, which are subject to no rule but the arbitrary one of the priest's pleasure.

Mosheim thus refers to the development in question :—

“ Among the Latins grievous offenders who before had to confess their sins in public were relieved from this unpleasant duty; for Leo the Great gave them leave to confess their sins privately to a priest selected for that purpose. In this way the ancient discipline, the sole defence of chastity and modesty, and the actions of men, were subjected to the scrutiny of the clergy, which was greatly for their interest.”—*Eccles. Hist.*, p. 196. Lond., 1861.

The penitential system of the Church in the public form was found to be so favourable to the prevention and cure of public and scandalous sins, that many Protestant writers of eminence have lauded the utility of the institution in the early ages of the Church. Thus Guizot (*History of Civilisation in Europe*) says—

“ In the institutions of the Church there was an article which has been hitherto very little noticed, namely, its *penitential system*. The study of this system is rendered much more interesting at the present day, since it is almost completely in accordance with the ideas of modern philosophy as to the principles and objects of penal law. If we investigate the nature of the punishments used by the Church, of the *public penances*, which were its principal mode of inflicting chastisement, we shall find that their main design was to excite repentance in the criminal, and, by the example, moral terror in the beholders.”—P. 111. Edin., 1848.

In the process of development, however, the Pope changed the whole character of the ordinance by the single step of making it apply to sin *in its divine relation*, and not merely to sin as affecting the character of the Church. Hence of necessity it came to include private as well as public offences; and as including private sins, it must next include private as well as public confession, private as well as public penances, and private as well as public absolutions. By degrees, and with an equal desire on the part of

priest and penitents, one of these requirements was substituted for the other in each case. Thus audible confession before a whole congregation was gladly relinquished for the less painful ordeal of auricular confession to the priest ; the public penances, found so salutary for the correction and prevention of the scandals of the Church, were exchanged for the priestly impositions of the Confessional ; absolution from church censures was converted into absolution from sin, or the public pardon pronounced by the priest, as the representative of the congregation, was changed into the *Absolve te* pronounced by the priest as the representative of God. In a word, the processes of an ecclesiastical discipline, having its foundation in Scripture precepts, were totally diverted from their original purpose, invested with the character of a sacrament, and adroitly employed in the acquisition of temporal wealth and the exercise of a gigantic tyranny.

One part of the ordinance, however, penances — now called, to suit the changes introduced, “ sacramental,” instead of “ canonical ” penances—the Pope still retained the power to administer, either in a private or public form, according to the character of the offence he wished to chastise ; that is to say, sins not deemed prejudicial to the *secular* interest of the Church or the Pope’s authority, were left to the private discipline of the Confessional ; but offences affecting either the temporalities of the Church, or the jurisdictional usurpation of the Papacy, and more especially offences committed by the civil, official, or political opponents of the Pope, were sure to be smitten with the rod of *public penances*. Such exercises of the Pope’s power, in relation to princes and others, are familiar to the readers of ecclesiastical history, and need not be transcribed here from the pages of mediæval record. Passing from the political applications of the Confessional in those days, it will be sufficient to illustrate the system by some references to

The Confessional in the Present Day History of the Papacy.

We read in “ the sure word of prophecy,” that at “ the

time of the end the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion," Dan. x. 26. Some may dispute the application of this text to the Papacy, but none can deny that judgment now providentially sits on the crimes of the system, and that the dominion of its ruler is being taken away with a judicial-like rapidity and vengeance. The political difficulties which are gathering round the Papacy have naturally called into exercise a corresponding application of the usual means by which "his Holiness" is wont to defend his temporal interests. Political bulls, diplomatic allocutions, encyclicals, and excommunications, have all been tried to no purpose, the Italians and others having at length learned that the fury of the Pope is not the anger of God. Failing in his applications of the spiritual sword, the Pope has proved his willingness to try the temporal weapon, under the generalship of Lamoricière and other military heroes. But here, again, failure succeeded failure. The judgment still sits, and sits with an ominous indication of retributive justice. The "secular arm" upon which the Pope heretofore relied, and from which he heretofore has received support, is the very arm now being raised "to take away his dominion."

The only arm which the Pope has been enabled to enlist in his service is the assassin arm of that brigandage which is indigenous to the soil of the Papacy. The Pope has long employed fire and sword to clear his territories of heretical subjects. In this he succeeded, and has gained in their room those bands of desperadoes which have so long proved the terror and scandal of the Italian soil. The Pope's appeal for help to this quarter has been responded to with much cordiality, and for more reasons than one. Cardinal Antonelli, the grand vizier and political right hand of the Pope, happens to be himself the son of a brigand chief, who, with his family associates, heretofore formed one of the most infamous and notorious gangs of confederated murderers to be found among the banditti of Italy. But another cause, cementing the *entente cordiale*, or political connection of the brigands and the Pope, is the instinctive conviction, on the part of the former, that the

day which terminates the Papal *regime* in Italy, will also bring their own lawless career to a close. Hence brigandage has been glad to make common cause with the Pope against Victor Emmanuel ; while the priests have eagerly enlisted the services of these volunteers, turned the Confessional into a recruiting box, and fraternised with the brigands as one of the religious orders of the Papacy. The subjoined official testimony will sufficiently explain the support given by this Order to the Pope's cause, being

Extracts from Signor Massari's Report to the Italian Government.

"We have been assured, and the assurance has been repeated in all the districts which we have visited, that from the *Confessional* proceed the incitements and the encouragements to the crimes of brigandage. . . .

"In last December, (1862,) in the pulpit of one of the most crowded churches in Naples, a priest said, 'Our brethren, the brigands, are obtaining victories in different provinces of Italy, and will always obtain them, because they are fighting against a usurping king ; the Virgin cannot but perform the miracle of driving the usurpers from the kingdom.' . . .

"Romano, the chief of the brigand band of Givia, in the province of Bari, was in the habit of celebrating, by priests whom he paid for the same, a mass in the chapel of the Masseria Dei Monaci, which was commonly known as the 'Brigand's Mass ;' and he always found priests who, by imploring the Divine blessing on that crew of ruffians, attempted to make Heaven the accomplice of their crimes.

"At Minervina, in the very same province, a corporal of our army was lying on his death-bed, and the priest, when called to administer the consolations and sacraments of religion to the brave man, who had fought against the brigands, *heartlessly refused them*. . . .

"The brigands are extremely superstitious. They wear under their clothes amulets and scapularies in great abundance. On certain given days their devotion to the Virgin prevents them from eating butcher-meat, although they never stop short from murder and robbery. . . .

"In order to make themselves invulnerable, to be secured against dangers, to brave death with courage, the brigands, when about to enter on their bloody and guilty enterprises, get themselves *consecrated by a priest, who delivers to them the wafer of the Holy Sacrament, which, by means of an incision in the flesh, is inserted into the root of the thumb !*

"Several brigands, who, not long ago, fell into the hands of justice, deposed to having *received from the priests little figures of saints*, which they were told to keep in their mouths, and which the priests promised them [would protect them from all harm in their encounters. Other brigands, captured in the neighbourhood of Zuin-goli, in the district of Ariano, wore on their breasts *the Papal star*. . . .

"Whenever they can (says General Villarey) they have litanies chanted in the woods, and they wear on their persons little images of the Virgin and horns, to protect them against the influences of the evil eye. When the brigand serjeant, Romano, was out on his raids, he used to write sentences full of pious ejaculations; and he called the assassins who depended on his orders, 'the sworn soldiers of the Catholic faith!'"

The Report then supplies a copy of the brigand's oath, in which they swear to defend, even with "the shedding of our blood, God, the Pope, Francis II., and the commander of their column, and to destroy the followers of the tri-coloured flags."

The Report then subjoins the confessions of Forgioni, a brigand chief, of which the following are passages:—

"*Brigand*—We were fighting for the faith, and we are blessed by the Pope; if I had not lost a paper which came from Rome, you should be convinced that we were fighting for the faith.

"*Judge*—What kind of a paper was it?

"*Brigand*—It was a printed paper which came from Rome.

"*Judge*—But what were the contents of the paper which came from Rome?

"*Brigand*—It said that whoever fights for the holy cause of the Pope and of Francis II. does not commit sin.

"*Judge*—Do you recollect anything else in the paper?

"*Brigand*—It said that the real brigands are the Piedmontese, who have taken away from Francis II. his kingdom; that they were excommunicated; and that we are blessed by the Pope."

After more of this examination, the Report proceeds with its statements, from which a few more excerpts are culled:—

"In the province of Salerno, five Capuchin monks were arrested in March 1862, because they gave every kind of assistance to the brigands. In order to convict them, some of our soldiers disguised themselves as brigands, and in that disguise received from the unworthy monks the kindest reception and a quantity of provisions,

with the assurance that the convent * was victualled for four hundred brigands.

“The Convent of the Liguorine Fathers at Pugani, in the province of Salerno, was a regular recruiting station for the brigands. In the city of Andria, in Terre de Bari, many placards were circulated last August, with the following words:—‘The brigands are blessed by the Pope; and as often as they fight, they charge in the name of God, and are sure of victory. A deputation, therefore, must be formed to go out and meet them with a white flag, and bring them into the town, and then everything will be finished.’

“In this town of Andria, having a population of more than 20,000 souls, there are some three hundred priests and monks; and there have been cases—as was verified after the defeat which, in the beginning of November 1862, a large brigand band sustained at the hands of the Montebello Lancers, in the neighbourhood of Lucerna—*there have been cases in which the priests actually belonged to the bands.*

“We are therefore compelled to arrive at the conclusion that, in the southern provinces, brigandage receives from a portion of the clergy incitement and encouragement of every kind.” †

These extracts from an authentic public document sufficiently attest that the Confessional and its sacramental adjuncts are made entirely subservient to the secular interests of the Papacy. One more testimony from another source is so much to the point, and so cogent in proving that the Pope himself is personally cognisant of, and co-operating with the secular and sacrilegious application of the Confessional, that it requires a place here.

The *History of the Pontificate of Pius IX.*, by G. B. Nicolini, is a trustworthy account of the Pope’s political career for the five most eventful years of his life, including the leading events connected with the overthrow of the Pope’s Government by the most bloodless and virtuous revolution that ever subverted a throne of tyranny. Nicolini, adverting to the calm forbearance of the Republic in relation to the abounding abuses discovered in the seat of the Papacy, laments some of this lenity in these words:—

“But what we were too delicate about, or rather too foolish, was

* Male and female monastic institutions are alike called *convents* in Italy.

† For a more enlarged reference to the Report, see the *Daily Review* of 24th Sept. 1863.

in not at once publishing many of the iniquities connected with religion. Of these we discovered very many proofs, one in particular, which was irrefragable. When the Dominican Friars, alarmed by a popular tumult, hastily fled from their convent, they left behind them, in their hurry, a very precious document, which disclosed their practices. This was a volume of autograph letters from many different Prelates, Bishops, and ordinary priests, addressed to the President of the Inquisition. Every one knows that *this is the Pope*, who, however, leaves all these affairs to the General Inquisitor—a Dominican. *In almost every one of these letters it was found that the writer had violated the secrets of the Confessional*, secrets which they declare so inviolable that one of their own authors (I do not at present remember which) says somewhere, that ‘God himself never knows what you say to your confessor!’ And it is worthy of remark, that in almost every instance the secrets revealed in these letters *related to political and state affairs*, no matter in what country. Many of these letters were written by *Irish and English Prelates*; and from the whole of these letters it was clearly evident, which, however, was well known to us before, that THE CONFESSIONAL IS NOTHING BUT AN ENGINE OF POLICE.”

Nicolini then goes on in a footnote to state that these letters remain unpublished, simply because the Republicans lost possession, both of these and many similar documentary treasures, by the counter-revolution and the Pope’s return to Rome. He refers to a number of living witnesses of high character to corroborate his statements—statements from which our British statesmen may learn that the business of the Confessional is a political business—that “Irish and English Prelates” are deeply engaged in this business, and that the drift of their Roman communications is not only political, but seditious and treasonable in relation to the constitution and policy of the British commonwealth.

These numerous appeals to testimony and the fruits of the system sufficiently show that the Confessional violates alike the institutions of God and man. As a religious ordinance, it converts a gracious and indispensable element of conversion, repentance, into a legal ordeal in which the priest assumes the position of a high commissioner from heaven, sent to hear sin, to punish sin, and to pardon sin—a triple assumption of divine prerogatives, which transcends every insult ever offered to God by the profanity of man or the malignity of Satan.

In its social relations no device of the enemy ever approached the power of the Confessional in disseminating moral corruption, making priest and penitent a mutual source of debasement and profligacy. It associates every circumstance calculated to stir up the fountains of unholy desire, and kindles, instead of serving to quench, the fires of a passion which Popery itself has professedly invented monkery or monastic rules and conventual prisons to subdue. In the one case, she separates men and women to subdue lawful connubial desires ; in the other, she brings them together in the close propinquity of the Confessional, in order to raise these feelings to that pitch of ungovernable desire, which has ruined so many "Priests, Women, and Families." See for such results the work bearing the title just quoted, a work written with equal argumentative power and purity of expression, by Michelet.

Not less formidable for evil is this tremendous engine of iniquity in its political relations. By it priestcraft has triumphed over kingcraft itself. The supremacy of the Pope is derived from the supremacy of the Confessional. No other agency could succeed in making mankind the puppets of his will. Here alone is the instrument which furnishes the priest with the knowledge that constitutes power—power to originate and prosecute personal or professional intrigue—power to antagonise and evade law—power to resist the magistrate, propagate treason, distract the political relations of kingdoms, amass wealth, and bring all these operations into one grand triplicate result—the good of the Church, the greater good of the priests, and the greatest good of the Pope.

Other governments are obliged to acquire all needful supplies of political information, just like the merest individual in the pursuit of knowledge, by the observation, experience, and industrial investigation common to all mankind, or within the ordinary reach of human agency ;

"But here is a government altogether peculiar and unique, which, by the simple artifice of assuming a spiritual name, and professing to have nothing in view but the everlasting welfare of mankind, contrives to enter, not into the houses only or the affairs, but into

the very thoughts and hearts of men, and in this manner secures for itself such an amazing knowledge of the characters, designs, and circumstances, not only of its own immediate subjects, but through them of others, that an amount of physical strength a hundred-fold greater, but wielded with inferior knowledge and skill, will be found practically, and, at the long run, far less influential over human affairs."

Thus in every state foreign to the Papacy, the Pope has subjects possessed of that knowledge which Bacon calls power, and which has again and again given the Papacy victory over opposing polities, infinitely superior in the articles of physical force and material means.

Duty of Civil Governments in Relation to the Confessional.

The question of the Confessional sufficiently indicates the right of the magistrate to supervise the principles and practices of religion, and to exercise a discretionary power to suppress whatever he regards to be hostile to the civil welfare of the subject, however this element of civil hostility may be made the matter of religious profession. Protestants ignorant of Popery, and especially those who would restrict the magistrate's functions to purely political affairs, will be apt to regard any proposal advocating the legal suppression of the Confessional as a proposition embracing unwarrantable religious intolerance. Setting aside, then, the magistrate's right to deal with questions or institutions of a purely religious character, his claim to deal coercively with the Confessional will depend on the question, whether the Confessional is a religious or political institution. If this "whether" is to be determined by the ecclesiastical powers interested in the case, as a matter of course they will decide that the Confessional is a purely religious and spiritual ordinance. But the magistrate, guided by evidence, must come to a contrary conclusion. When the two governments (ecclesiastical and civil) thus clash, *one must rule, or both must fight*. Popery claims the right to rule in the case; unadulterated Protestantism—Protestantism purged from the leaven of Popery—will accord this right to the magistrate.

In order to show the purely secular origin, object, and organisation of the Confessional system, the question of its claim to a religious character has already been examined, with the result that the ordinance called Penance has no religious element whatever in its constitution, even when the question of its constitution is judged of by the principles of Romish theology itself. Roman Catholics themselves will freely concede, that if it be no sacrament, it is no part of their religious system. Well, that Penance, tried by the Romish rule for the constitution of a sacrament, *possesses no one property of a sacrament, has already been conclusively proved.* Penance, therefore, and its inclusive Confessional scheme, is no part of the Romish religion, judged by its own principles; and consequently any attempt to subject it to control or suppression by the civil power, however it might be construed as an infringement upon social or civil liberty, can never be regarded as an act of *religious* intolerance.

No further arguments, therefore, need here be used to dissipate the notion that the Confessional is, in any sense, a religious rite. The pretentious blasphemy that the priest hears sin *as God* carries a lie upon the very face of it, for the priest hears sin as one *ignorant of it before he hears it*, and needs to hear it in order to pardon it; whereas God hears the sinner's confession—not to acquire a knowledge of sin, and not as a requisite either for the pardon or punishment of sin—but as a voluntary expression and token of that repentance for which the priest has substituted the blundering sacrament he calls Penance.

The priest, therefore, hears sin, not as God but as man, and as man in an illegal position; he hears sin as a conspirator against the constitution of the realm, as the emissary of a foreign potentate, as a counsellor of sedition, a receiver of stolen property, an accessory both before the fact and after the fact of crime, as a discoverer of individual and family secrets, for the purpose of promoting his personal or professional aims, and for a thousand other objects directly subversive of social morality, of the due operation of civil legislation, and the rightful authority and prerogatives of the Civil Ruler.

Such being the character and such the fruits of the Confessional, as evidenced by an almost unlimited variety and extent of human experience, its tolerated existence in any civil community is one of the most singular illustrations of political insanity to be found in the history of stultified government. Hence, one of the first, perhaps the very first, indication that governments have awakened to the interests of morality, social progress, and true political reform, will be the

Legal Suppression of the Engine of Priestcraft called the Confessional.

Such a legal suppression of the Confessional should be agitated and advocated in the face of all opposition from the shallow, drivelling, and most impertinent cry of intolerance. One of the most essential duties of a tolerant government is the suppression of intolerant principles and institutions. No government is faithful to the principles of toleration which tolerates intolerance. There is no occasion to charge Popery with intolerance, for it publishes the fact; it makes this principle not merely a rule of action, but a profession and a boast! Neither is it necessary to charge the priests with being the ministers and agents, the very police of this Popish despotism. These are facts of which the world is convinced; but what the world needs to be convinced of is, that *the Confessional, and Confessional alone*, is the effective implement for the propagation of this despotism, and the simple suppression of this one institution would be, and doubtless will be, the destruction of Popish despotism throughout the world.

“The maintenance of priestcraft,” says a British senator, “is *Auricular Confession*. The key to the vast influence of the Roman clergy lies there. As long as this practice continues, the usurped privileges and immunities of the ecclesiastical order are safe; withdraw it, and mankind, like beings disenchanted, begin to find out the imposture, and rebel against the tyranny.”—*Hints to Thinkers*, by W. E. Baxter, Esq., M.P.

Here is a “hint to thinkers” which our parliamentary *talkers* (the word parliament, from the French *parler*, ap-

propriately enough signifies *a place of talk*) would do well to receive from one of the most enlightened of their senatorial brethren, a hint which sufficiently indicates the duty of all rulers with respect to the legal suppression of this most infamous of all Romish institutions. If an institution which debases the people in the same ratio as it exalts the priest, abstracts the wealth of society by the most fraudulent pretexts, defeats political councils by the most clandestine intrigue, spreads immorality like a plague, and vitiates the whole constitution of society, and the whole machinery of civil government, just in proportion as its baneful operations are allowed to spread and fructify in the national soil, then the Confessional, with all its debasing appurtenances, needs the speediest and most effectual abolition by every state having the least respect for the morality of its subjects, the peace of society, or the unembarrassed and successful operation of its own political legislation.

Legal Suppression of Confessional Publications.

Reference has just been made to the appurtenances of the Confessional. The law should not stop at the mere suppression of the clandestine, demoralising, and illegal intercourse between the priest and his penitent : it should extend suppressive legislation to all those debauching publications which have reference to the Confessional intercourse of both, or which profess to have for their object to train the priest in the art of hearing and the penitent in the counter art of making confession. Most of these instructions have received publication under the veil of monkish Latin, but some are so vile, even to the blunted moral sensibility of the priests, that they have never ventured to commit them to print, as Michelet thus states :—

“A worthy priest has often told me that confession was the plague of his profession, the torment of his life, and drove him to despair. The preparatory studies which the priest is obliged to undergo are such as not unfrequently to destroy the constitution ; the body succumbs, the soul is enervated and polluted. . . .

“Printed books have been quoted, but no one has brought to light the *manuscripts* which complete the education of the young

seminarist during the last two years of his studies ; these manuscript books contain things which the boldest have never dared to publish."—*Priests, Women, and Families*, part ii., chap. ii.

With these contaminating aids to matriculation in the science of profligacy it may be difficult for any government to deal, but in relation to the *published* obscenity of the Papacy, even the statute-book, as it already stands, contains sufficient enactments in relation to obscene literature to suppress the Confessional treatises of Dens, Liguori, and others in the same school of authorship. Why these statutes for the confiscation and suppression of obscene literature are applied to lay publications, and left unapplied to the far more scandalous and polluting productions of the Popish priesthood, is one of those anomalies which belongs to the same school of politics that pronounces Popery "damnable and idolatrous," and at the same time pays the priests for teaching it. It makes no apology for the case that these publications have come into circulation in a "dead language." Dead languages are fast becoming living tongues, and, at all events, the debauchery and infamy wrapt up in the Latin of Rome have been given to the public in translations, which, although made with the best intention by Protestant hands, are not the less pernicious to many whose eyes have been brought in contact with their polluting pages.

If, therefore, it is the imperative duty of governments to protect society against the influence of such infamous literature, and if there are at present acts in the statute-book fully empowering the magistrate to suppress and confiscate the lewd and beastly publications of the Church Papal, it behoves social reformers to investigate and agitate the question of their suppression, and never to cease their exertions until these publications of the Papacy are committed to the flames by the hands of the common hangman.

Political Relations of Confirmation.

As the Romish sacrament called Confirmation ratifies baptismal relations and engagements, to appreciate its temporal significations and effects, regard must be had to those

of Popish baptism. These have been already explained ; but a summary reference to the temporal relations and obligations created by Romish baptism may be subjoined here. The Scripture expression, "baptized into Christ," (Rom. vi. 3,) signifies our union with Christ, and subjection to His authority in all those relations created by the reception of His atonement. As the Pope is the representative of Christ in relation to baptismal privileges and obligations, to be "baptized into Christ" is to be similarly "baptized into the Pope." Again, as the authority of Christ in relation to baptismal obligations extends alike to temporal and spiritual interests, it follows that *if* the Pope represents the authority of Christ in relation to baptismal obligations, that representative authority extends alike to the temporal and spiritual interests of baptismal subjects.

Such is the theological theory by which the Pope seeks to claim an unqualified supremacy, in temporals as well as spirituals, over all the baptized. There are Roman Catholics who seek to violate this plain theological teaching of their religion, but the Pope has again and again decided against them ; and though he has been obliged to resign the *power* he claims by virtue of baptism, he has never resigned his *claim* to the power.

Confirmation, as already intimated, ratifies all the relations and engagements of baptism. The subject of baptism is personally passive ; the subject of confirmation is personally active, conscious, and voluntary. He becomes *self*-pledged to the Pope's authority—to receive salvation at his hands, to resign the right of private judgment, to accept every dogma, and submit to every precept in which he has been "confirmed" by this Papal ordinance ; in a word, to render to the Pope all the obedience due to Christ, and claimed by the Pope, as "vicar of Christ," in the 10th Article of the Pope's Creed, under the title "true obedience."

And here, again, by accepting and professing this Creed, those Roman Catholics who reject the Pope's authority in temporals, enhance their religious inconsistency. That this true obedience includes temporal authority is decided by

the whole Canon Law. It is the Pope's own interpretation of the term, and as no one has a right to put a decisive interpretation upon an authoritative document but *the author of it*, it follows that when a Romanist would seek to confine the meaning of the term "true obedience" to spiritual allegiance, he usurps the right of private judgment which he voluntarily renounces in his Confirmation, and puts his own interpretation upon a point of faith which the Pope, the author of it, has, by that very fact, the exclusive right to interpret and define.

Confirmation, therefore, as a ratification of baptismal relations, pledges all Romanists to render political as well as spiritual allegiance to the Pope.

Other political and social relations spring from this rite by reason of its sponsorial system. The Pope is so solicitous about securing the obedience of his subjects, that he is not satisfied to have them both baptized and confirmed into his authority, but each of these sacramental obligations has to be guaranteed by the accountable sureties called sponsors.

"Sponsors, therefore, are with great propriety required in the administration of the sacrament (of Confirmation) also, and the same affinity which, as we have already seen, is contracted in baptism, impeding the *lawful marriage* of the parties, is also contracted in Confirmation."—*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, p. 201, Donovan's R. Catholic Ed. of 1829.

The Catechism is not accurate in alleging that *the same* affinities are created by Confirmation and Baptism. They are *new and additional* affinities, or spiritual relationships, forming *new and additional* impediments to what the Catechism rightly calls "lawful marriage." And these new impediments are even more injurious to social liberty, and repugnant to the rightful provisions of civil law, touching the marriage relationship, than what usually occurs from the similarly created impediments by the sponsorial system of baptism. In the rite of baptism, the parties baptized and the sponsors are, for the most part, matrimonially unmatched by reason of disparity of age. But, in confirmation, the confirmed and the sponsors may often be of equal ages, and in all respects suitable to contract with each

other matrimonial engagements. Hence this impediment is such a violation of natural and national rights as no government should allow.

Of course, the case may be represented as mitigated by the fact that the Pope can release from his own made rules "forbidding to marry" by a *dispensation*. But dispensations belong to cost, and, instead of mitigating, aggravate the Pope's usurpations in relation to civil rights. Hence every civil government is not only bound to abolish all impediments to marriage, except such as the Bible creates, but to protect the subject from such forms of ecclesiastical swindling as the Pope employs under the title of dispensational grants,—that is, grants for liberty to fulfil God's commands!

The Romish Eucharist.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation is the distinctive feature of the Romish caricature of the Lord's Supper; and although commonly viewed as a purely religious dogma, like every other element of the Romish system, it involves political and social influences not to be overlooked in treating the secular relations of Popery.

Although inspired by the genius of absurdity, it does not the less captivate the reason. The warfare of priestcraft against reason, revelation, and realities, reached the climax of conquest in the creation of this unparalleled tenet. By it, says Gibbon, Innocent III., who first gave it dogmatic existence, "accomplished the most signal triumph over sense." To account for its introduction and acceptance in the world, seems to be an impossible problem, if we had not a key to the difficulty in the doctrine of development. Dogmas, calculated to shock the most obtuse and credulous intellect, make an easy conquest of reason when their absurdities are made imperceptible by that process of slow growth which marked the

Development of Transubstantiation.

If ever a doctrine was indebted to development for its existence in the world, it must be the present. Nothing

but a stealthy, gradual, and masked aggression upon human reason could possibly have reduced the world to believe in a dogma despicable even to idiots. Had the apostles and early teachers of the Church broached this doctrine to the enlightened heathen, it must have infallibly invalidated the whole Christian system. The apostles established Christianity by an appeal to the evidence of miracles; that is, to the *evidence of the senses* exercised upon miracles. But if the senses are not accepted as competent evidence to prove that Transubstantiation is false, it follows that they cannot be accepted to prove that Christianity is true.

The process by which this dogma came to maturity may be thus briefly traced:—The boldness of the metaphorical language employed by our Saviour in the institution of the Supper induced the early fathers and teachers of the Church to indulge their rhetorical genius in the use of similar imagery, and to employ language which led to the notion that at least *some change* was effected in the elements after and by the words of consecration. At first the change was confined to the notion of a *spiritual presence* of Christ in the sacrament,—a notion too spiritual to satisfy the increasing carnality which constitutes the mainspring and regulator of all Romish development.

Hence succeeded the doctrine of a *corporeal presence* in the wafer, now called the “real presence,” and constituting the dogma technically termed Consubstantiation. It required but one step more, and that an easy gradation, to advance this last development to the climax of absurdity called Transubstantiation.

For a time these different views obtained a simultaneous existence in the Church; but as the growth of falsehood, like the growth of truth, is a progress to unity of principle, Transubstantiation came to be the prevalent belief. In the progress of a development, we have seen that the prevalence of belief is always a necessary prelude to that theological treatment by which an opinion, as yet but nebulous and undefined, comes to be cleared of obscurity, and propagated with the distinctness of a tenet. The first who essayed to perform this service for Transubstantiation was Paschacius

Radbert, abbot of Corbey, in France, who published his treatise in the year 831, and afterwards a second edition, which he presented to Charles the Bald about the year 845. The book was immediately opposed by several able writers, and especially by Bertram, (also called Ratram,) one of Abbot Radbert's own monks; by Rabanus, archbishop of Mentz; John Scotus Erigena, (John, the Irish Scott;) and the celebrated Berenger, or Berengarius, a canon, and a Principal of a school at Tours, who, adhering to the views of Scotus, found his account in those persecutions which have made his name illustrious. The controversy was long and bitter; and as the maintainers of the dogma were better endowed with zeal than logic, they brought to their aid not only the authority of the Church and the secular arm, but the evidence of miracles. Of these, Bellarmin, in his history of the controversy, enumerates too many to be mentioned. *Ab uno disces omnes*: "Christ was seen in the wafer in the form of a little child!"—*De Eucharistia*, lib. iii. c. 8.

At length, as already intimated, Nicholas III., having found the controversial pear fully ripe, declared in favour of Transubstantiation; and in the 4th Lateran Council (1215) prepared and pronounced that decree which the historian has characterised as the mightiest triumph of superstition over sense.

Many metaphysical crudities, however, still adhered to the new dogma. Nor was it until the Council of Trent itself sat in renewed and final deliberation upon the bantling of the Laterine fathers that the "cub was licked into shape," and developed with all the fulness and precision with which this dogma was treated in numerous canons and chapters of the Council, and with which it has been guarded in the supplementary, but not so well known

Regulations of the Missal on the subject of Transubstantiation.

But a few specimens of these extraordinary rules are subjoined:—

"If a consecrated host should disappear, either by accident, by

wind, or a miracle, or be devoured by some animal, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated.

"If, after consecration, a gnat, a spider, or any such thing, fall into the chalice, and if it produce nausea to the priest, let him draw it out, and wash it with the wine; and when mass is concluded, let him burn it, and let him throw the ashes and washings into a sacred place. But if there is no nausea, and he fears none, let him swallow it with the blood.

"If any poisonous matter touch the consecrated host, then let the priest consecrate another, and receive it in a proper manner; and let the poisoned one be preserved in a box in a separated place *until the species be corrupted*, and then let the corrupted species be thrown into a sacred place.

"If any of the blood of Christ fall on the ground or table by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, the place must be thoroughly scraped, and the scrapings burned, but the ashes must be buried in holy ground.

"If the priest vomit the Eucharist, and the species appear entire, they must be reverently swallowed, unless nausea prevent; and in that case the consecrated species must be cautiously separated from the vomit, and laid by in some sacred place until they are corrupted, and afterwards they are to be thrown into a sacred place; but if the species do not appear, the vomit must be burned, and the ashes thrown into a sacred place."

Such are some of the filthy and disgusting profanities which have come to be naturally and necessarily involved in this dogma.

Sundry Developments resulting from Transubstantiation.

The principle of development associates a certain prolific characteristic, which does not appear to have precisely occurred to Dr Newman himself, in his skilful treatment of this new rule of faith. From this property it often happens that a new dogma has scarcely broken the shell, and received the imprimatur of the Pope, when certain consequences, unforeseen even to infallibility itself, are found to result, and whether welcome or unwelcome, must be adopted as the necessary offspring of the parent Development. This tendency of one development to beget others, admits of some special illustration from the history of Transubstantiation.

The dogma had scarcely obtained any degree of practical recognition and adoption when certain awkward results

began to appear, to violate the feelings of the pious, and to produce in the first instance, the

Development of Wafer Communion.

The bread of the Sacrament, which before was merely regarded as bread, being now believed to contain a material Christ in every particle, had to undergo a new preparation for practical administration. In the administration of the ordinance with the use of ordinary bread, crumbs and fragments were necessarily produced, dropped on the floor of the church, trampled on, and swept out in the cleanings of the house. So long as the bread was regarded as remaining unchanged in the ordinance, this created no sacrilegious apprehensions in the minds of the pious. But now every crumb dropped on the floor was a Christ dropped, every crumb trampled on was a Christ trampled on, and every particle carried out in the sweepings was a Christ swept out of His own house, and exposed to all the further vicissitudes of the street nuisance, with which He was mingled !

To avoid the scandal of these consequences of the new dogma, the Church adopted the expedient of exchanging the ordinary bread for the Eucharistic wafer, an article so prepared by the art of the pastry-cook that its use produced none of those fragmentary detachments which the priest says, contains "a whole Christ in every particle thereof."

It made no matter that in the new form of administration, the remedy employed to avoid an imaginary sacrilege produced a real one; the *bread was no longer broken according to the appointment of Christ* and the direction of Paul, "*The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ?*" 1 Cor. x. 16. There was no choice in the case. The new dogma involved practical consequences, both unforeseen and scandalous, and a remedy (the wafer device) must be adopted, even at the expense of violating an express Scriptural command.

Development of Half Communion.

The like consequence resulting from the use of the bread

was created with, if possible, still more sacrilegious scandals by the use of the wine. Every drop of the wine accidentally spilled in sacramental communions, created the horrifying reflection that it was no longer wine, but the blood of Christ, which was thus literally trampled beneath the feet of the guilty wretches He came to save ! Such an additional scandal required an additional remedy, and the remedy adopted was still more effectual than the one employed in the case of the bread. It was easily seen that the wine scandal could not be cured by administering the wine in some new form, as in the case of the bread. Could the wine—the blood of Christ—have been solidified like the blood of St Januarius, and then made into sanguiferous wafers, such a miracle would have done, but how to perform it the priests found not. Hence there was but one way left to remove the scandals incidental to the use of the wine—that is, *to exclude the use of it altogether*. “Drink ye all of it,” says Christ. “Drink ye none of it,” says the Pope ; “Let all abstain from the cup, except the priests, whose mishaps in the use of the wine are provided for in the Rules of the Missal !”

Thus the unforeseen results of Transubstantiation created a necessity for “half communion,” instead of whole communion, of violating an express command of Christ, and even of reversing a universal rule in the principle of development itself. The errors of Popery are all on the side of multiplication, instead of subtraction. Perhaps the doctrine of half communion is the only development in which the Papacy has failed to follow this rule, and to deduct from, instead of adding to, an original ordinance of Christ. Another development follows, the

Development of Fasting Communion.

Christ administered the bread and wine of the first communion after *a feast* ; the Pope ordains that none shall receive them except after *a fast*—a change supposed to be required in order to a reverential reception of the transubstantiated elements. So long as these elements were regarded as having undergone no change divesting them of

the character of natural food, their reception into a previously occupied stomach was judged to be in harmony with, instead of opposed to, the devotional reception of the ordinance. But when the idea of Transubstantiation came to be established, then also it came to be regarded as no less than sacrilege to mingle Christ's body and blood with a meal of indigested food. Hence the priests found the necessity of meeting this new difficulty with a new rule—the rule of fasting communion.

Development of Host Worship.

To these developments succeeded another necessary result of the new dogma, the *Worship of the Host*. The priest would doubtless have gladly exempted himself and his flock from this debasing idolatry. Manhood, reason, and revelation all conspired to shame both priests and people from the grovelling act of worshipping an object manufactured by the joint craft of the priest and pastry-cook. The workmen made it, and therefore it is no God, Hosea viii. 6. But there was no choice: the first commandment required God to be worshipped; transubstantiation declared the wafer to be God; therefore the wafer must be worshipped—worshipped even although the doctrine of "Intention" leaves it a case of uncertainty whether the wafer has become a God, or remains a morsel of dough. Thus it may be truly said to the Romanists, as Christ said to the Samaritan idolaters, "Ye worship ye know not what," John iv. 22.

Development of the Mass.

Prior to the era of Transubstantiation, the mass was at most but a corrupted representation of the Christian sacrifice. But when the representative presence of the victim was changed into the "real presence," the representative sacrifice, as a necessary consequence, became a real one,— "a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead."—*Pope Pius's Creed*, article v.

And here, it may be observed in passing, that the article "a" creates a misreading of the passage quoted; it has no representative in the original Latin of the Creed, and in-

volves a meaning contradictory to the theology of Popery, which declares that the mass is the *same* sacrifice as the cross. As there is but one sacrifice of the cross, if the mass is "the same sacrifice," then the proposition quoted from the creed should be read with the definite article ; *i.e.*, "The mass is (not *a* but) *the* true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead."

It required the utmost stretch of a diseased imagination to realise the monstrous fiction which professes to identify two objects in which there are no two points of resemblance, much less of identity. But development is a progress in paradox as well as in doctrine. Transubstantiation, the great prolific prodigy of the Papacy, necessarily developed a progeny of lies "after its own kind ;" the next in the list being the

Development of a Sacrificing Priesthood.

So long as the bread and wine of the Eucharistic ceremonial were regarded merely as memorials by which Christ's death was shown forth, or as a mere representative sacrifice, the priest could only be regarded as a representative priest. But a real sacrifice requires a real sacrificer. Hence, when the representative sacrifice became transubstantiated into a real sacrifice, the representative priest was necessarily transformed into a real priest. Here we have the key to the extraordinary zeal with which the Church of Rome has always been affected in reference to Transubstantiation, including all its developments, but more especially the last—a sacrificing priesthood. To be a priest, and more especially to be a priest personating the great High Priest of Christianity, perpetuating the same sacrifice, effecting the same atonement, and applying or withholding the merits of the offering according to the pleasure of his "Intention," was all that was necessary to develope the utmost degree of doctrinal blasphemy in the Church, and the highest exhibition of arrogance and ambition in the self-dubbed "Priest of the New Law."

Development of Infidelity from the Dogma.

Almost every individual who has left the Church of Rome

has confessed that from the doctrine of Transubstantiation first sprang those doubts which ultimately ended in a denial of Popery, and too often in the rejection of Christianity. Nor is it the natural influence of the doctrine merely to infidelise the mind of those within the Church. It erects an equal and most repulsive barrier to the acceptance of the gospel by the three great classes of erroneous religionists, the Heathen, the Mohammedan, and the Jew.

That the heathen is hardened in his rejection of Christianity by this dogma we may learn from the remarkable case of Overroes, a heathen philosopher of the eleventh century, who gave his reasons for rejecting Christianity in these terms :—

“I have inquired into all religions, and have found none more foolish than the Christian’s, because that very God they worship they with their teeth devour;” and thus he concludes, “Quandoquidem Christiani id comedunt quoad adorant : Because the Christians eat what they worship, *let my soul go to the Philosophers.*”

Transubstantiation is the highest infamy with which the Mohammedans are wont to reproach Christianity, as M. La Boulay thus informs us :—

“They affirm that by thus eating Christ’s flesh the Christians use him worse than did the Jews; because they say it is more savage to eat his flesh and drink his blood than only to procure his death.”

It is notorious that the Jews are specially hardened against Christianity by the image worship and other practices of Popery, and by none more than by the Popish abuse of the Lord’s Supper. In one of the very books accepted as inspired Scripture by the Church of Rome, and valued by the Jews as expressing the sentiments of the nation—namely, the prophet or historian Baruch—we read,—

“That the deities which the Babylonians worshipped were afterwards eaten; and by this,” continues Baruch, “*ye may know that they are no gods.*”—*Apocrypha, Book of Baruch, vi. 72.*

Surely the Council of Trent, when it incorporated Baruch in the inspired canon of the Papacy, had left unnoticed the singularly plain rule by which all “*may know*” that the wafer is no god.

However this dogma, which mingles together in one article of belief the utmost degree of the profane, the absurd, and incredible, came to be imposed upon mankind ; when once introduced and believed, no religious tenet could more effectually elevate the priest in his own eyes or exalt him in those of the people. Taken in connection with its development called the Mass, the dogma not only, as we have seen, exalts the priest to an equality of power with God in relation to human salvation, but infinitely transcends every display of miraculous agency performed by Divine agency. The incarnation of Christ is the greatest miracle ever accomplished by Divine power,—a miracle in which God dispensed with the most indispensable of all natural laws, and formed a single Christ from a single parent. But what of that? the priest not only forms a single Christ from every wafer, but from every particle of the wafer ; so that every wafer is at once a single Christ and an infinite plurality of that which is but one !

It is easy to suppose that a dogma which invested the priest with such stupendous power, ministerial and miraculous, would effectively aid him in those political and lucrative acquisitions which form the staple articles of the priest's religion. Hence it is that no dogma, not even the supremacy of the Pope itself, (a denial of which is the treason of canon law,) was ever guarded with more official vigilance by the watchmen of the Papacy. History shows us that a denial of this dogma formed the great "burning error" of all those heretics whom the Church brought to the stake when her power to persecute was equal to her persecuting principle.

In the reign of Mary, when Popery was re-established, and the principles of canon law were restored to the English statute-book, a denial of Transubstantiation was a greater political crime than treason, and Latimer, Ridley, and a whole host of victims were burned at the stake for rejecting the deity of the wafer. It was no intentional retaliation, but a just estimate of the civil evils resulting from this profane tenet, that in future reigns the holding, instead of the denial, of Transubstantiation was rightly made a political crime. In the reign of Charles II. Ro-

manists were found so loyal to the Pope and their religion, but so treasonable to their sovereign and their country, that an act was passed (30th Charles II.) excluding Papists from parliamentary membership. To guard against the infringement of this act, by Papists assuming the guise of Protestants, (always a lawful policy with Popery,) the act included the well-known

Royal and Parliamentary Declaration against Transubstantiation.

“ I [A. B.] do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper there is *not any transubstantiation* of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatever.”

This declaration, which further includes a profession against the sacrifice of the Mass and the worship of the Virgin, was removed from the statute-book, both in relation to Roman Catholic and Protestant members of Parliament, by the fatuitous Act for “ Catholic Emancipation ” in 1829.

The policy of expunging the above declaration from the statute-book is not less questionable, as a concession to Popery, than inconsistent with other provisions of the law, by which it may be easily inferred that

Transubstantiation is a Clear Violation of Statute Law against the Crime of Blasphemy.

Blasphemy, in a purely religious sense, is an aggravated sin, tending to defame the Divine attributes, and thereby to destroy the salutary effects resulting from a belief in the perfections and government of God. Hence civil governments, being fully aware how much such a belief tends to the wellbeing of society, to the maintenance of civil authority, and obedience to the law, have always, and both in Roman Catholic and Protestant countries, recognised certain forms of this offence as a crime against the state, punishable by common law or special statutes.

“ Among the Canonists the definition of blasphemy is made to

include the denial of God, or the assertion of anything to be God which is not God, and this extended application of the term has been received in most Christian countries, and punishments have been affixed to the offence.”—*National Encyclopædia*, vol. iii., p. 411.

It may not be always an easy matter to define the act which constitutes, or ought to constitute, the punishable commission of this crime ; but Blackstone, the great interpreter of English law, includes in its definition “ contumelious reproaches of Christ,” and any disparagement of Christianity, “ exposing it to contempt and ridicule,” Book ii., ch. iv.

The Scotch law against the offence is now about uniform with the English. The most recent case involving the offence was tried before the High Court of Justiciary in 1843. In the course of the trial, the prisoner, who conducted his own defence, endeavoured to justify the course he had taken by arguments drawn from the Scriptures which he had publicly libelled and exposed to contempt and ridicule. But the court ruled that the offence was not one to be decided by theological discussion, but by the existence and signification of the law on the subject, and that, while that law gave full scope to the exercise of private judgment, it expressly provides that “ all blasphemies shall be suppressed.”

Now it only remains to be inquired, whether the multiplied and varied profanities connected with the belief and associated practices of Transubstantiation do not involve this crime, or whether it is possible for any manifestation of human profanity to embrace more “ contumelious reproach of Christ,” or more associations tending to expose Christ and Christianity to “ contempt and ridicule.” Nor do such effects result merely from the theoretical absurdities of the dogma, from its ritual observances, or even from the irregularities so disgustingly specified and provided for by the canonical legislation of the Missal, but from numerous other abuses, of which we give an example :—

“ I had a mind to see,” says Bishop Burnett, “ a picture that I was told was over one of the Romish altars in Worms, which one would think was invented by the enemies of Transubstantiation, to

make it appear ridiculous. There is a windmill, and the Virgin throws Christ into the hopper, and He comes out at the eye of the mill *all in wafers*, which some priests take up and give to the people."—*Burnett's Letters*, &c., Letter v.

In accordance with such associations of this dogma, and with the tenor of the civil law in relation to the crime of blasphemy, the framers of the Thirty-nine Articles, judging the Mass (which, of course, includes the profanities of Transubstantiation) to be a "contumelious reproach of Christ," and a profane mockery of His sacrifice, calculated to "expose Christianity to contempt and ridicule," felt no hesitation in characterising this dogma as "*blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit*."—Art. 31.

As the Thirty-nine Articles are homologated by the civil law, the dogma of Transubstantiation is, to all intents and purposes, a declared blasphemy by the British Legislature, and, as such, the practical exhibitions of Popery in relation to this dogma are properly *obnoxious to the penalties of blasphemy as defined by the law*.

A conviction leading to such a result, of course, would be met by a reference to Rome's theological teaching, which, like the party convicted in the Edinburgh trial of 1843, she would endeavour to justify by an appeal to distorted Scriptures. But this defence could no more succeed in the one case than the other. Her own teaching is quite sufficient to convict of the crime she would seek to defend. She asserts by her councils, as seen above, that "the assertion of anything to be God which is not God," is a punishable blasphemy; and as no argument from Scripture, reason, or fact can possibly prove the wafer to be God, her own teaching, instead of involving her defence, *necessarily involves her condemnation in the case*.

As law and justice are different things, it may or may not be justifiable in human policy to rank and punish blasphemy as a political crime, and to make that offence include the practical exhibitions associated with the dogma under notice; but so long as the law *does* recognise blasphemy as a criminal offence, and so long as the infamies connected with Transubstantiation clearly involve that crime, then

this tenet should either be prosecuted in the persons of its professional propagators, and suppressed in its practical profanities, or the law against blasphemy should be repealed like others as a concession to Popery.

But it requires small apology to justify the State in its legislative policy against the crime of blasphemy. Religion alone furnishes sanctions sufficiently powerful to secure human society from anarchy and revolution ; and it effects these results just in proportion as its institutions are regulated by that Divine revelation which, being given to benefit nations as well as individuals, for public as well as for private ends, is under the guardianship of the magistrate as well as the care of the ministry.

In conclusion, here the right of the magistrate to deal with blasphemy as a crime is a question in political ethics which depends upon the broader question, whether government has a right to defend its own institutions from calumnious and libellous aggression. It will not be denied that the acts which tend to bring the institutions of the state into public contempt, and which must lead to the subversion of its authority, and the consequent evils of anarchy and revolution, should be punished and suppressed. Hence, when a government adopts religion as an institution, it is bound to defend that institution when so invaded by the assaults of superstition, profanity, and blasphemy, as to bring Christianity into a state of public disaffection and contempt. Nor will such power, when rightly exercised, at all affect either the fullest exercise of private judgment, or the temperate expression and propagation of opinions on the being or attributes of God, or the tenets of the Christian religion. It is not the matter or the expression of our opinions in this case, but the *manner* which associates a calumnious, contemptuous, and desecrating form of attack upon the principles of Christianity, which properly constitutes the virus of political blasphemy.

Extreme Unction,

Or the unction applied at the *extremity* of life, is for that reason also called the *Sacrament of the Dying*. It is, how-

ever, only to be administered to such as approach the extremity of life by "sickness," and not to individuals in the prospect of death from other causes. Hence it is denied to criminals about to be executed, those in danger of death by the sword of battle, shipwreck, operations in surgery, and other adventitious circumstances perilous to life.

The Council of Trent says, that as Christ appointed other sacraments to support the Christian with spiritual aids during life—

"So did he guard the *close of life*, as with a most firm defence, by the sacrament of Extreme Unction."—Sess. 14.

The Council, adverting to scriptural authority for the Sacrament, says—

"It was insinuated indeed by Mark, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by the apostle James."—Sess. 14.

This so-called Sacrament, therefore, is founded on Scriptural directions for the use of an unction which, so far from being intended as a religious ordinance preparing for death, was actually employed, both in the account of Mark and James, with a certain deliverance, or a promise of *deliverance, from death*. In the one case, we read that the disciples "anointed with oil many that were sick, and *healed them*," Mark vi. 13. In the other case the anointing was followed with the promise, "And the Lord shall *raise him up*," James v. 16.

That the passage of James, upon which the Council and Church chiefly rely, affords no foundation for the Popish sacrament, is evident from several other considerations, some of which may be here slightly adverted to.

In the first place, the unction of James, as well as that of Mark, required a *plurality* of elders or administrators, whereas the administration of a sacrament not only may but must be restricted to one elder. Dr M'Hale, Romish Archbishop of Tuam, Ireland, was so conscious of this fatal discrepancy between the Scripture anointing and that of his Church, that in quoting from James in support of this

sacrament, he deliberately falsifies the teaching of the apostle after the following fashion :—

“Who instituted this sacrament? Jesus Christ. St James says, ‘If a man be sick among you, let him bring the *priest*; let *him* anoint him, praying over him, and if he is in sins, they will be forgiven him,’ James v. 14.”—Dr M’Hale’s *Christian Doctrine*. Dublin: T. Coldwell, 50 Capel Street. 1840.

Without dwelling on the garbling of the divine text by the omission and dislocation of clauses in the verses quoted, and quoted in *quotation marks*, the bishop here not only fraudulently misrepresents the apostle, but lies to support the fraud. Thus he substitutes the word “priest” for “priests,” or elders; and the command, Let *him* pray over him, for the scriptural command, Let *them* pray over him. Hence when he prefaces these false quotations with the assertion that “St James says” what he has said in the passage he falsifies, he but fulfils that scriptural mark which tells us that such as should “depart from the faith” would also “speak lies in hypocrisy” to support their apostacy.

The passage in James refers hypothetically to sin: “If he be in sins (says the Douay text) they shall be forgiven him;” that is, if the sick party happened to be a previously unjustified sinner—guilty in soul, as well as diseased in body—pardon would be opportunely granted with the cure of the body. The presence of sin, therefore, was by no means necessary to the integrity of the institution; that is, to constitute the case one for anointing; and, consequently, the anointing applied could be no sacramental ordinance.

The practice of Rome herself sufficiently shows that the reference of this unction to sin is a “development” of the Church, and not a deliverance of the apostle. If intended for sin, why apply it to an individual not according to his sin, but according to the way he dies? If the Church has been traditionally directed to apply this unction for sin, why is it that not merely different individuals, but the very *same individual* having the *very same* sins, will receive this unction when about to die by one form; while, if he should

happen to die in any other manner, he is denied the sacrament, and must carry his sin to his grave? Has the Church gathered from James the strange doctrine that different modes of death require different modes of pardon?

That the unction was never originally intended for a form of sin but for a form of sickness, cured by miraculous and not sacramental power, will be made obvious by a very brief reference to the

Development of Extreme Unction.

The doctrine of development has necessitated or induced a process of inquiry and controversy not heretofore associated with our efforts in the refutation of Romanism. Formerly it was generally thought sufficient to take the doctrines of Romanism as so many facts, and simply expose them as anti-scriptural and absurd. But since the Church, by her doctors, has come to confess that the great bulk of her doctrines, instead of being originated by the apostles, have had their origin in the process of "development," it becomes a necessity of the controversy to trace these dogmas to the respective sources and causes from which they have sprung. This process of inquiry, besides adding new interest to the controversy, also furnishes the most effectual mode of exposing the falsehood of the dogmas examined. A sage has said, that to trace an error to its source is the most effective way to refute it. Hence the practice of tracing the errors of Popery to their respective sources, besides being an exigency demanded by the doctrine of development, is also of admirable service as a mode of refuting these errors.

In the Gospel of Mark we learn that Christ gave a miraculous commission to his disciples, sending them forth in pairs to exercise the commission given:—

Mark vi. 7. "And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and gave them power over unclean spirits. Ver. 13. And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them."

After the death of Christ these miraculous and healing

powers were transmitted by the apostles to the elders of the Church, 1 Cor. xii. 1-10. The gift of healing at least was, in all probability, a common gift possessed by the elders of the Church in general, else James could not have given his directions in such unreserved and general terms. As Christ gave the original commission to the disciples in *pairs*, so James reiterates this plurality, and says, "Is any sick among you? let him send, not for the elder, but the *elders*."

In a very short time after the establishment of Christianity, the teachers of the Church ceased to "continue in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship;" and we learn from ecclesiastical history that miraculous gifts also ceased at an early period. Various opinions have been offered both as to the cause and time of this cessation of the miraculous gifts of the Church. The writer submits an explanation which he is satisfied will be found true, if it should not be found new—that just in proportion as the apostacy, that is, Popery, increased, the miraculous powers of the Church declined, until the one having arrived at a certain stage of development, the other was fully and finally withdrawn in the way of divine retribution. Thus we may thank Popery for the loss of those miraculous endowments of the Christian Church, which she has ever since endeavoured to simulate by her "lying wonders."

When the gift of healing was thus providentially withdrawn from the Church eldership, those who had read the book of grace by the book of providence, as a matter of course, ceased to call for the elders of the Church. Like Protestants at the present day, the sick ceased to resort to the practice of anointing, seeing that God no longer accompanied the use of the sign with the healing result signified. God promised to bestow this latter only in answer to the elders' believing prayer—"the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up." But a graceless and apostate priesthood could not be heard in the supplications proper to the ordinance. They had "departed from the faith," and as a consequence could not offer the prayer of faith.

Under these circumstances, the fraudulent instinct which inspires the Papacy soon prompted the priests to adopt that "refuge of lies" by which they now deceive their flocks in reference to the original use and signification of this anointing ordinance. It was designed, says this lying spirit, speaking by the mouth of its prophets, not for the cure of the body, but for the benefit of the soul. Thus the priests at once concealed the barrenness of their faith in relation to the bodily cure, and laid the foundation for the conversion of this bodily ordinance into a sacrament. Such a perversion of the apostle's language was much facilitated by the *sound* of the words in the passage, by the incidental reference to sin, and especially by the presence of an oil, which provided the priest with such a plausible material for the "outward and visible sign" of a sacrament. With these facilities, aided by the sinner's desire for a death-bed opiate, the priests had small trouble in making this a welcome addition to the sacraments of the Church.

There was but one difficulty in the development, and it remains to the present day, although it now appears to offer no obstacle to a general belief in the as yet *undefined* virtue of the sacrament. The apostle James alludes, and manifestly, to *all* sin. "And if he have committed sins"—sins of any kind, however mortal, these mortal iniquities shall be forgiven in connection with the corporeal cure. Further, according to Romish teaching, the "if" here excludes the possibility of "venial sin" being the sin implied, because the Church of Rome teaches that no man can live without venial sin, and she quotes, as well as perverts Solomon, to prove that even "the just man falls seven times,"—that is, she says, falls thus daily into venial sin. Hence, according to Rome herself, the apostle cannot refer to venial sin, neither can she prescribe Extreme Unction for mortal sin; for the remission of the latter is fully provided for by the Sacrament of Penance. The Sacrament of Extreme Unction being thus made theologically inapplicable to both mortal and venial sin, the Council of Trent was obliged to leave the virtue of this sacrament undefined, and we learn from the following quotation from Father Keenan of con-

troversial notoriety, that the Church remains in the same fix up to the present time. Priest Keenan attributes the remission of *some kind* of sin to the sacrament, and then asks the

“Q. Are the sins thus remitted mortal or venial ?

“A. St James says in general, ‘And if he be in sin, his sin shall be forgiven him.’ Hence all the sins of which we may be guilty are forgiven, if we are truly sorry for them. *The Church has not decided positively as to what kind of sin is forgiven.*”

Thus, then, the priest here asserts, on the authority of James, that by this sacrament “all the sins of which we may be guilty are forgiven.” But the Church comprehends all sins under the two classes, mortal and venial. Hence Extreme Unction has a greater amount of justifying power than Penance itself, for Penance only remits mortal sin, while Extreme Unction “remits all sin,” or *both* mortal and venial. But the concluding part of the priest’s explanation is yet more extraordinary ; for while he says Extreme Unction remits all sins of *every* kind, he immediately adds, that the Church has not decided “*what kind* of sins are remitted by this Unction.”—*Catechism of the Christian Religion*, vol. ii. p. 80.

Social and Political Relations of the Dogma.

Like every other religious device of the Papacy, Extreme Unction teaches the lesson that the priest is the sole depository and disposer of the grace required by the sinner. It teaches this lesson at a very awful moment in the history of the soul, and for this reason it excites a peculiar degree of dependence upon the ghostly impostor, who makes it the means of loosening the purse strings of superstition for the good of the Church. As every sacrament of the Papacy has its particular grace, so it has its particular price, and as this is the *last* grace which the priest bestows, he generally makes it the occasion of levying the largest exaction for the Church.

All the circumstances of the occasion conspire both to stimulate and facilitate the speculative propensities congenial to priestcraft. The *will* has now in most cases to be made,

or if previously made, the priest, by means of confession, soon manages to ascertain its contents in relation to the interest of the Church. If these are not satisfactory, every effort is made to have it modified or codicilled for the benefit of the Church and the robbery of relatives. Such robberies have sometimes been defeated by the protective statutes which priestly rapacity has made necessary for the defence of relatives and rightful claimants. These laudable efforts of the legislature, however, *purely from the ignorance of our lawmakers in relation to the principles and overreaching power of Popery*, have all but failed in their intended object ; so that the Mortmain and other protective acts are now known to be totally inadequate to secure society against the system of deathbed plunder which the Romish priesthood are enabled to put in practice under the influences and opportunities afforded by this "sacrament of the dying."

One of the most prevailing of these influences results from the doctrine of Penitential Satisfaction. The Romanist is taught to believe that the virtue of a priest's absolution depends upon the payment of this temporal debt of sin, either by the due performance of penitential works, or the discharge of the debt in the fearful prison of purgatory. As a deathbed can afford neither time nor ability for the performance of penance, the spiritual culprit, as a matter of necessity, must endure the awful alternative of purgatorial suffering. But Rome can find a remedy even here, if the penitent can only find the means to pay in cash, instead of suffering. This convenient transmutation of penitential into pecuniary satisfaction, although a profane attempt to barter the dross of earth for the favours of heaven, is not the less, but rather the more meritorious for sin ; for while the one but satisfies God, the other satisfies both God and the Church ! Further, although this pecuniary satisfaction is acquired and appropriated in the name of *alms*, such acquisitions are really applied either to the support of the priests or the institutions of the church ; the bequests of the dying being in nine cases out of ten appointed for the payment of masses, the erection of mass houses, nunneries,

or the promotion of other schemes for the advancement of Popery.

At length the will and other temporal concerns of the dying Papist being settled under the control or counsel of his ghostly father, the latter proceeds with the "solemnities" of the last sacrament, that is, with the solemn mummeries of the act called anointing—an act consisting of a variety of indecent and disgusting manipulations, devised with a view to enhance the delusion of this deathbed opiate and piece of sacramental sorcery.

The social and civil evils of this ordinance might be illustrated by innumerable practical references. Some few years back several of these occasioned a protracted examination by a Mortmain Committee appointed by Parliament. In noticing some of these, the excellent little handbook by Dr Begg, says—

"Simple Protestants have no idea of the various unhallowed methods by which Popish priests contrive to convert the dying agonies of their unhappy victims into a vast source of wealth. In the instance mentioned by Lord Abinger in the House of Lords last winter, they contrived, in the case of a feeble-minded youth who died in their clutches, to oust all his relations—secure at one stroke £190,000, and make their plundered victim previously wear a hair shirt into the bargain!"—Begg's *Handbook of Popery*, p. 184.

The doctor further notices some strictures of the *Daily News* on the evidence given before the Mortmain Committee, which are partly re-quoted here,—

"The Romish clergy fund is supported by deathbed contributions. By its rules, enforced by the bishop's mandate, every priest who is a member of the club, is required to be its representative in the chamber of his sick or dying penitent, and to obtain, if possible, a *bequest in its favour*. To do this the more effectually, the clergyman frequently offers his services as *will-maker on those occasions*."—*Ibid.*

The *Daily News* then refers to several cases illustrating this species of plunder, and among the rest, relates that—

"A poor Irishwoman, ousted of her property by a will made under sacerdotal influence, came to the Archbishop of Dublin for advice. Mr Wale, (the archbishop's son-in-law,) being then in Dublin, and having his attention thus called to the main question, had

the curiosity to cause searches to be made in the Dublin Registry of Wills, with the view of ascertaining whether such cases were, as asserted, rare in Ireland. In these searches he says, 'I confined myself strictly to cases in which the death of the testator took place immediately after the date of the will, marking the length of time in each case; confining the searches to the period intervening between April 1848 and 1850. In that one Consistory Court, no less than *eight such wills, all made by Roman Catholics, in extremis, under clerical advice and for clerical purposes, were found to have been proved during that brief period!* From *forty to fifty* others, not made *in extremis*, but presenting circumstances for observation at least, if not for suspicion, were also produced to him. In two cases the wills were actually in the *hand-writing of the priests who attested the execution*; and in one of these the name of the testatrix herself clearly appears to have been actually unknown to the priest who made it!' One will presents a characteristic and curious Hibernianism. The testatrix being a married woman, it was seen that she had no power to make the proposed donation; and, therefore, in order at once to give her that power, and at the same time to propitiate her unwilling relict, *she* was made to subscribe herself as widow, and to *him* a legacy of £100 was bequeathed by the will! The scheme failed—the husband entered a caveat, got the assets, and defeated the will altogether."—*Ibid*, p. 185.

Those who wish to see more such authenticated cases, may consult the "Catholic Layman," vol. ii., pp. 15 and 42. Here they will find cases of deathbed plunder, in which no less a personage than Cardinal Wiseman was principally concerned. The particulars of these robberies were also elicited by the Mortmain Committee of the House of Commons, and published by order of the House. The first case was that of *Mairterie v. Wiseman*, in which no less a sum than £7000 was fraudulently transferred to the exchequer of the Church from the property of a deceased Frenchman. The next case was that of Mr Taylor of Weybridge, in which another large property was wrested from the rightful heirs by a series of frauds practised by Wiseman's priests upon that gentleman, while under the influence of mental imbecility and death-bed prostration!

Orders.

Orders is a Popish sacrament, which is held to impart to those to whom it is administered the gifts and graces necessary to dispense the religion of Christ with saving efficacy.

The number and name of the orders are—Porter, Reader, Exorcist, Acolyte, Subdeacon, Deacon, and Priest. Why the Church omitted to include the higher official grades of Bishop, Archbishop, &c., does not appear, unless her predilection for the number *seven* compelled her to construct the sacerdotal ladder with just this many rungs and no more. Many of the later exponents of her theology, seeing the inconsistency of excluding Bishops as a distinct order, have endeavoured, contrary to the teaching of the Council of Trent, to rectify the anomaly by treating the Episcopacy as an *eighth* order. Priest Keenan manages the difficulty in this way :—

“There is nothing to prevent us from considering the Episcopacy as an *eighth order*, since Bishops are raised above Priests by their character and spiritual authority, as Priests are raised above Deacons.”—*Catechism of the Christian Religion*, vol. ii. p. 83.

But whether the “orders” of Rome be seven or eight, or more, there is an obvious blunder in comprehending all the orders in a single sacrament ; for a sacrament in Popery can only be the channel of one kind of grace administered through one kind of “matter,” and one kind of “form,” whereas each of the Popish orders confers very distinct functions and privileges by very different external signs and words.

This will be made specially obvious by a comparison of the two offices, distinguished by the terms Priest and Bishop. We know, of course, that the Scriptures identify these two offices, and that the two words but express different aspects of the same order of church teachers. Jerome, the translator of the only authentic Romish Bible—the *Vulgate*—was so convinced of this, that he not only identifies the offices, but says that the received difference between them was made by the “instigation of the devil.”

Further, the *Vulgate*, and its translation, the Douay Bible, furnish evidence that if these offices are scripturally different, the Papacy has precisely reversed their official relationship as regards the process of ordination ; that is, instead of the Bishops being endowed with the power to make Priests, the Priests were invested with the power to

create Bishops. The Douay Bible, in its preface to the 1st Epistle to Timothy, says that Timothy was the first Bishop of Ephesus ; and in the same Epistle the Apostle Paul admonishes Timothy respecting the source from which he derived his office and authority, in these words :—

1 Tim. iv. 14, *Douay Version*. “Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the imposition of the hands of *the priesthood* ;”

that is, of the *Presbyters* or Priests who ordained him to the office of Bishop.

Hence the spiritual inoculation called “Apostolicity,” if it have any sacramental existence, runs in the ecclesiastical blood of the Priests instead of the Bishops. But whether the apostolic mission and commission came through an order of Priests or Prelates, it is certain that they no more come through a sacrament, than the same mission and commission came by such a channel from Christ to His apostles at the first.

In the scriptural sense, Ordination simply signifies the appointment of an individual, by the imposition or “laying on of hands,” to a disciplinary or teaching office in the Church. The act of laying on hands indicates the duties and prerogatives of the *office*, but bestows none of the *qualifications* necessary for its exercise. These, if ever possessed, must be acquired, not by the physical operation of the Popish sacrament, but by ordinary study, aided and guided by ordinary grace. Ordination is simply a spiritual diploma. It does not communicate the gifts necessary to office, but declares the gifts (so far as human judgment can discern) to be already possessed. It is a declaration that an individual has a *right* to use certain powers, simply because it has been ascertained that he possesses them. Hence (although wherever there is a *capacity* to teach religion, there is also the *right*) the separation of an order of men to the exclusive duties of the ministry was a provision of the New Testament economy, designed not to invest them with a teaching monopoly, but to place them in circumstances wisely calculated to enlarge and mature their capacities for the better discharge of so important an office.

Hence the Sacrament of Orders is simply a device to fortify the priest's monopoly with respect to prerogatives common to all the Church. The priest's assumption of a "divine right," or an exclusive commission to teach and propagate Christianity, is a gross infringement of the divine right of laymen—a violation of that divine commission by which all possessed of divine truth are not merely privileged but commanded to communicate it, according as it is written,—

Jer. xxiii. 28. "He that *hath* my word let him *speak* my word faithfully."

Development of Popish Orders.

The principle of development has been no less fruitful in producing a multiplicity of offices than a multiplicity of doctrines in the Papal system—as doctrines grew out of doctrines, offices grew out of offices; the one forming the bloated creed, the other the swollen corporation of Antichrist. Anything like a detailed reference to the numerous official developments of the Papacy would require a volume, instead of the few remarks about to be offered, chiefly in reference to the general distinction of clergy and laity, and to the office of Priesthood, as fundamental in the first of these classes.

The ordinary conception of the Church as consisting of two elements, the laity and clergy, is an erroneous idea, leading to much confusion both of statement and argument. *The Church*—meaning by this, what the Scriptures exclusively mean by the term, the body of the saved, Acts ii. 17,—embraces no such distinctions as those referred to. Its constitution is entirely simple. That which constitutes membership is saving belief in Christ. Hence an office-bearer, *as such*, is a mere adjunct and no essential part of the body. Were mere office-bearers members of the Church, then Judas, who had "neither part nor lot" in the body, would have been as true a member of the Christian commonwealth as any whose names have been written from eternity in the "Lamb's book of life."

Hence the Church is exclusively a body of laity, and all

officials are foreign to its constitution. The most devoted minister is external to the Church in his official capacity. Every believing minister is not only a member of the Church independent of his office, but *exclusive* of his office.

Every one conversant with the controversy knows that Rome exactly reverses this relationship of the laity and clergy, and that, in all that concerns the agitation of Church questions, the ecclesiastical body assume to be the Church, to the exclusion of the laity. There is scarcely a question in the controversy in which Rome has not managed to derive valuable argumentative advantage from the present and various other misapprehensions and misapplications of the term *Church*.

This usurpation of the term Church was accompanied by other priestly assumptions of terms and privileges proper to the laity, more especially those about to be noticed.

In the Jewish Church, the mutual relations of the officials and laity were fundamentally different from those in the Christian religion. Paul, alluding to this difference, writes,—

Gal. iv. 1, 2. "Now I say that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all, but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father."

Such was the state of the believer under the law. It was to him the term of his minority, and a period of servitude under the official tutelage and government of the Aaronic priesthood. At the introduction of Christianity, the lay relationship to the Church official was entirely changed. The believer obtained his majority, and an ecclesiastical *magistracy* was changed into an ecclesiastical *ministry*. Hence Peter cautions the teachers of congregations no longer to assume the exercise of a lordship over the heirs of that inheritance which the Christian believer is put in possession of,—

1 Peter v. 1. "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Ver. 2. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not

by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; Ver. 3. *Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.*"

That is, according to Albert Barnes, the commentator on the last verse, lay believers were no longer to be ruled by the principle of "authority," but by the influence of "reason, persuasion, and example."

The word "heritage" here used by Peter as a synonym for the word flock, is worthy of special notice. The corresponding Greek word of the Testament is *cleros*, which signifies a lot, or an inheritance obtained by lot—that is, by Divine appointment; for "the lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord," Prov. xvi. 33.

Believers, therefore, are here called God's heritage, because God regards them in the light of an inheritance of which He becomes possessed; or, the word heritage is here used as synonymous with heirs, the inheritors being called the heritage—the possessors by the name of the thing possessed—through the use of the grammatical figure metonymy.

At all events, as our word *clergy* is directly derived from the word "cleros," and as the apostle employs the latter to designate the "flock," in contradistinction to the "elders" whom he addressed, it follows that the flock (that is, according to the present-day phrase, *the laity*,) and not the elders or officials, *are the clergy of the Church*. It would seem passing strange at the present time, if, instead of describing the Church to consist of clergy and laity, we should adopt the phraseology of Peter, and call them respectively the elders and clergy!

The corruption of the Scripture in relation to the use of the word clergy formed one of the earliest developments of priestcraft. The priests perceiving the dignity and grace associated with the term, felt it would be no small professional advantage to rob the heirs of the title, and appropriate it, as they have done, exclusively to themselves. Of course, nothing but a period of the grossest scriptural ignorance could permit the success of so stupid an im-

posture. But that period speedily came after the age of the apostles. The officials of the Church then began to wear this borrowed plume, to assume a lofty strut, and command that reverence which the people were induced to pay them, as the special favourites of heaven, "God's heritage," the heirs-presumptive of the celestial inheritance. It is much to be regretted that this perversion of a scriptural term, and one of great importance as a pivot of doctrine, should have passed from Popery into the Protestant Churches, and thus left the Protestant advocate unable to administer a consistent rebuke to the Papacy for so palpable a fraud.

The usurpation in relation to the term clergy involved another of not less consequence in exalting the official of the apostacy and debasing the flock. In the Patriarchal Age, which embraced the original form of government, both in relation to temporal and religious concerns, one of the most important privileges falling to the possession of the family heir was the office of *Priesthood*. This rule has its antitype in the Christian system; that is, the heir to New Testament blessings inherits a priesthood with his spiritual kingdom,—

1 Peter ii. 5. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an *holy priesthood*, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Ver. 9. But ye are a chosen generation, a *royal priesthood*."

According to these verses, every believer in Christ is constituted his own priest, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, and especially to present and plead the sacrifice of Christ, as the ground of the sinner's righteousness and acceptance. For this reason the New Testament contains no official priesthood, and the word priest—that is, the Greek word *hiereus*—of the original, which we translate priest, but which should be rendered sacrificer, is *never applied to a New Testament church officer by the inspired writers*.

It was, however, only natural that as the officials of the apostacy filched the title of clergy—heirs or heritage of God—they should seek to spoil the heirs of the priesthood which Divine appointment associated with the heirship.

Accordingly, the officials of the apostacy were not slow to appropriate a title and usurp an office which so obviously tended to their professional exaltation. Priesthood, or the office and duty of a religious sacrificer, is in its very essence *mediatorial* and *propitiatory* between God and men. Hence to transform the priesthood common to all the heirs of salvation into a professional function peculiar to the officials of the Church, formed another of the early steps in the development of the hierarchical system called Orders.

As the priestly office is the foundation of all that influence by which the officials of Rome succeeded in enslaving the world, it becomes an important object to trace the development of this order to its origin and causes. The guilt found in the human heart by the inherent and perpetual testimony of conscience, plainly tells man of his separation and distance from a holy God, and the necessity of a mediatorial agency to restore him to the favour of his Maker. Revelation met this want, to a certain extent, by the institution of a priesthood, whose functions were essentially mediatorial, or intercessory and propitiatory, although but typical of those proper to the great High Priest whose office alone could give spiritual efficacy to the services of the symbolical or Jewish priesthood. When once that High Priest of our profession came, and by His mediatorial work perfected the way of access to God, the sacerdotal office being fulfilled and exhausted in His work, was for ever abolished; that is, a human priesthood—a sacrificial, propitiatory, and intercessory office—was no longer admissible; for where the antitype is come, *the type necessarily ceases*.

The fact, however, that Christ thus fulfilled, and thereby abolished, the mediatorial office in His Church on earth, neither banished the sense of the mediatorial want from the breast of humanity, nor satisfied that want when Christ himself was not apprehended and embraced as the “one Mediator between God and men.”

Hence, even so early as the fourth century, the mere teaching office of the New Testament ministry no longer met the requirements of a degenerate and superstitious

laity who lost sight of Christ, but retained in their hearts the keen sense of the mediatorial want—that unalterable consciousness of guilt—to which reference has been made, and which calls for a “days-man” between the soul and God. In this condition of the Church, with Christ out of sight, and His *professed* representatives in view, what remained for the instinct of error but to exalt the servant to the position of his Master—to reconstruct the office of a human priesthood, and to invest the gospel-teacher with the sacrificial and propitiatory functions proper to Christ! The natural result of thus putting a human mediator into the office of Christ, was an exchange of objects in relation to the exercise of faith—man was made the subject of trust instead of Christ, and all that dependence and veneration due to the Saviour, came to be transferred to the mediatorial usurpers of His office.

The development of this office was speedily followed by others, indicated and facilitated by the Jewish model, which first suggested the formation of a gospel priesthood. The original constitution of the Jewish priesthood included only one order of priests, with the high priest. But actuated by the same erroneous instinct, or the same instigation of the devil, to which Jerome attributes the creation of an episcopal office distinct from the Presbyter, the Jewish churchmen formed an order called (Matt. ii. 4, and elsewhere) “chief priests.” Such distinction not being found in the scriptural institution, of course was maintained by the Pharisees on the authority of tradition. Popery following the example of the Pharisees, similarly divided the New Testament ministry of the Church into priests and chief priests, or bishops, the Pope being the New Testament analogue of the Hebrew high priest. Many intermediate ranks, as archbishops, metropolitans, primates, &c., were subsequently developed between the bishops and the Pope, until the hierarchy of the Papacy parodied the official gradation of a grand army, embracing a vast variety of forces, under innumerable ranks of commissioned officers, and headed by the Pope as the *generalissimo* of the whole of these formidable legions. Thus offi-

cered, the myrmidons of Antichrist constitute a real "church-militant," warring not against "the world, the flesh, and the devil," but in the full and undivided interest of these three great enemies of Christ and the Christian Church.

Political Relations of Priesthood and Priestcraft.

The influence of Ecclesiastical principles and policy upon national interests, is sufficiently illustrated by a reference to the causes which led to the national calamities of the Jewish nation. These causes were obviously and exclusively referable to the character and crimes of its official priesthood. The career of this wicked race began with idolatry, and ended with the crucifixion of the Son of God—an act productive to the Jews of those national judgments which still continue, and which have exceeded all other judicial visitations both in the severity and duration of the curse.

But, however dark in character and dreadful in consequences was the career of the Jewish priesthood, it pales before the parallel crimes and curses produced by their New Testament successors in office and apostacy. Nor (if we believe the sure word of prophecy) will the fruits of this official apostacy cease, until, *as in the case of the Jewish nation*, they have produced that culmination of woes which is even now obviously awaiting the priest-ridden nationalities of Christendom.

It forms a subject of special importance, not only to know that national judgments are the result of religious apostacy, but that, both according to the history of the Old Testament and the prophetic teaching of the New, apostacy in religion has invariably its origin and development in the *official body*. All the warnings of the New Testament are directed to this fact. Paul and Peter are alike pointed in this respect:—

Acts xx. 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. Ver. 29. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Ver. 30. Also

of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."

2 Pet. ii. 1. "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them."

That the officials of religion, when not controlled by restraining grace, should be the primary source of its corruption, and should come to be distinguished by a pre-eminent degree of wickedness, is the natural result of a close but unhallowed familiarity with sacred things. To such familiarity is to be attributed the cauterised conscience and general insensibility to fraud, falsehood, and cruelty, with which history and experience have stamped the character of the Popish priesthood; and which have filled the world with Monkish imposture, Jesuit intrigue, and the numerous murders perpetrated in the name of God by "the Holy Office," or its courts of tonsured inquisitors.

Special developments of this priestly wickedness have long been distinguished by the term *priestcraft*. By *craft* is literally signified an art or industrial profession; but such art or profession has been so commonly abused for fraudulent ends, that the word generally associates the idea of professional knavery. In this sense, *priestcraft* is the vilest of crafts, and is so indigenous to priesthood, that in every age of the world, and in all systems of religion—Pagan, Jewish, and nominally Christian—the order has been characterised by the employment of fraud and imposture for secular ends. It was a saying of Cicero or some of the Romans of his day, that he wondered how two priests could look each other in the face without laughing, under a sense of their professional knavery! Priests, who have left the Church of Rome, tell us that the profits of purgatory form a standing joke with the craft of the Church!

As religion is the grand instrument in the prosecution of this secular knavery, *priestcraft* may be defined the art of prosecuting secular aims by religious means. To account for the extraordinary success of these aims, in the

hands of the Popish hierarchy, we have only to reflect on the new order of sanctions which a corrupted Christianity placed in their hands. Every other government, whether ecclesiastical or civil, up to the period of Christianity, upheld its tyranny and promoted its ends by an appeal to temporal penalties. Even the Jewish hierarchy never thought, much less professed, to secure submission to its authority by the sanctions of the world to come. But when Christ brought "life and immortality to light by the gospel," and the existence of a future state, with its tremendous sanctions of eternal rewards and punishments, the instinct of human selfishness speedily instructed the officials of the Church in the art of governing the world by *an idea*; namely, the idea that Divine justice must necessarily either condemn or save men in connection with certain conditions, and that these conditions, and consequently the destinies of all men in a future life, were placed at the disposal of a small minority, invested with the "powers of the world to come," by the sacrament of Orders!

The great political design of the Papacy, in the creation of Orders, was the organisation of a body so isolated from the world by the import and obligations of this so-called sacrament, that it should constitute an army of ecclesiastical forces devoted to the exclusive interest of the Pope. It was found, however, that even the sacrament of Orders, intended as it was to create the widest line of distinction between the priests and humanity, did not sufficiently fulfil that object, until aided by the

Institution of Celibacy.

Why the Church of Rome has appointed a sacrament to consecrate and aid the obligations of matrimony, and failed to make a similar provision in relation to celibacy, is not easy to see. According to the tenor of her teaching with respect to the exigencies of the latter condition, a sacrament of celibacy would be much more needed than a sacrament of matrimony. Celibacy, she says, is a state possessing a much more exalted degree of personal sanctity,

and, therefore, to sustain it, requiring a much more exalted degree of grace (which, according to her system, only comes through a sacrament) than the state of matrimony. However this may be, celibacy is ranked as a disciplinary, and not as a sacramental ordinance of the Church, and she calls this disciplinary state a *state of chastity*.

How much chastity is observed by priestly celibates, has been seen in connection with the subject of Confession, p. 119, and is sufficiently illustrated by the many laws which the Church herself has, even down to her latest conciliar legislation, been obliged to enact against sacerdotal profligacy. The Council of Trent could not escape attempting to deal with the evil, and certainly succeeded so far as to correct such abuses as those intimated in its legislation on the subject. In Sess. 29, we have chapter 15 headed with the title—“*The manner of proceeding against Clerics who keep Concubines prescribed :*” and in chapter 16 succeeding, we have the following, among similar enactments :—

“It shall not be lawful for the *sons of clerics, not born in wedlock*, to hold (office) in those churches wherein their fathers have had an ecclesiastical benefice, or any benefice whatever.”

As there is no institution of Popery fraught with more momentous bearings, religious, social, and political, nor one sustained by a more plausible perversion of Scripture, it falls within the province of these remarks to make some particular reference to the grounds upon which the Papacy seeks to support this unscriptural and unnatural concomitant of her priestly orders.

Christ, who restored marriage to its original sanctity by the prohibition of polygamy, lays down some admonitions touching celibacy as an exceptional condition, sometimes advantageous to religious life, but only to such as were *endowed with constitutional capacities* to receive the admonition given, Matt. xix.

The apostle Paul, in reply to the Corinthian Church on the subject, gives similar counsel, extended to certain particulars on which he discoursed by “permission” and not by “commandment,” 1 Cor. vi. 6 : that is, while the *record* of his

opinions in this place was inspired, the opinions themselves were not given by the commandment of God. Paul, however, is careful to qualify his counsels throughout by a reference to the Saviour's rule of *natural temperament*. "I would," says he, "that all men were even as I myself, *but every man hath his proper gift of God*, one after this manner, and another after that," 1 Cor. vii. 7. See the chapter throughout.

Thus these scriptural monitions are addressed to individuals possessing a certain natural "gift," in relation to the counsels offered—a constitutional adaptation to their fulfilment. Hence, the Church of Rome has committed a sacreligious blunder in prescribing these counsels to an order of ecclesiastics, instead of an order of natural temperaments, unless she holds that none but individuals possessed of a certain physical constitution, or a wifeless temperament, should enter the Christian ministry.

Again, that these instructions were intended to accord with certain peculiarities of temperament, and not with the functions of an ecclesiastical office, is evident from the fact that the advice given occurs in an epistle addressed to laymen—to the Corinthian "Church," (Greek, *congregation* or *assembly*,) and not to the Corinthian clergy—a case which illustrates the importance of our remarks on the word *church*, p. 198. But further, that these instructions touching marriage were not only addressed to, but intended *exclusively for laymen*, is made yet more evident by the fact that Paul, writing elsewhere on the same subject—marriage—gives the very opposite instructions, and gives these instructions *exclusively to the clergy*:—

1 Tim. iii. 2. "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife. Ver. 4. One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. Ver. 5. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God? Ver. 12. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well."

The plain import of these passages is, that the apprenticeship or duties of domestic government is required as a training agency for the right execution of the pastoral

office. Hence these duties are so far from being opposed to ministerial utility, that a right discharge of the domestic offices is, according to the apostle, the best guarantee for the due fulfilment of the pastoral functions.

The Douay Bible seeks to turn the edge of this passage, by the following note on 1 Tim. iii. 2, "It behoveth a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife."

"The meaning (says the Douay) is not that every bishop should have a wife, (for Paul himself had none,) but that no one should be admitted to the holy orders of bishop, priest, or deacon, who had been married more than once."

In the first place, the reference to Paul's case here is irrelevant, as Paul was an apostle, and no "bishop, priest, or deacon." The apostolic office was *itinerating*—a course of life in which a wife and family must be rather a hindrance than a help to the duty to be performed. On the other hand, the bishop, priest, or deacon, being each stated and stationary officials of the Church, would be as much aided by domestic connections, as the itinerating officer would be obstructed.

The exposition given to the expression "one wife," is merely gratuitous and arbitrary, having no correlative Scripture to support it, but the reverse. It has been already observed, that Christ restored matrimony to its original purity by the prohibition of polygamy, or restricting it to the possession of "one wife." Paul, knowing how hard it was to correct an abuse which Moses allowed to the Jewish priests and people, by reason "of the hardness of their hearts," obviously makes use of the expression "one wife," (one wife *at once*) to put away all excuse for perpetuating a practice which the authority of Christianity had for ever annulled.

Paul, having thus laid down a determinate precept for the marriage of the clergy in 1 Tim. iii., proceeds (let it be carefully observed) in the *very opening of the next chapter* to deliver his remarkable prophecy touching the coming apostacy and its marks, one of the most prominent being "forbidding to marry," 1 Tim. iv. 3. Thus, by the propinquity or close connection of the prophecy with the

precept, we have all but a demonstration that the mark "forbidding to marry" has reference to *clerical marriage*—in other words, that it was the very class, in relation to whom the apostle had just laid down his matrimonial ordinance, *that the apostacy would forbid to obey the rule.*

We know that the Church of Rome tries to make the apostle oppose his own rule, by reference to some carnal influences, which, she says, the apostle associates with the marriage state. But, even so, has she not, as she says, "exalted marriage into a sacrament," for the express purpose of correcting all abuses of matrimonial life? and how can her priests suffer from influences which may be fully corrected by the aid of what she herself calls "*a great sacrament,*" Eph. v. 32, *Douay Version.*

The fact is, that while Rome professes to add dignity to marriage by exalting it into a sacrament, her doctrine of celibacy is not only an implied calumny on scriptural marriage, but a plain disparagement of the efficacy of her own sacrament. The vow of celibacy is designated a vow of *chastity*, obviously with a view to propagate the notion that marriage is a state of comparative unchastity, and that married people are (at least relatively or in comparison with priests, monks, and nuns) unchaste! Paul, to whom the Church of Rome is fond to refer as an authority on the subject of marriage, says—

1 Cor. vii. 2. "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."

The apostle, of course, excepting those endowed with the constitutional temperament or "gift" disposing the possessor to a state of celibacy. Again he writes—

1 Thes. iv. 3, 4. "For this is the will of God, even your *sanctification*, that ye should abstain from fornication: that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour."

"Possess his vessel," that is, chastely use the body of the wife or husband, as the case may be. Thus, while Popery defames marriage by stigmatising it as a preventative of chastity, the gospel characterises it as a *preserva-*

tive of this grace—it contributes to the “sanctification and honour” of the married in the Lord.

If ever men needed this appointed preventative of fornication and preservative of scriptural chastity, those exposed to the influences of the confessional require that preventative and preservative. The rule that a “bishop should be the husband of one wife,” may be dispensable under some special circumstances, without injuring the utility of a Protestant minister, but there ought to be no exception in the Popish establishment.

Celibacy adopted on Popish principles is simply a rejection of marriage to indulge in fornication; and to associate it with the “Sacrament of Orders,” is to convert that sacrament into what might be far more correctly called the sacrament of adultery. If it were possible for such an institution as the confessional to fulfil its design, without associating sacerdotal profligacy, it could be so only in the hands and management of married confessors. To avoid fornication, let every man, but more especially *every priest*, have his own wife. Such a “discipline,” instead of the discipline of celibacy, would have saved society from innumerable evils, which experience has proved are the necessary fruits of a confessional, combined with celibacy.

The development of celibacy was one of slow growth in the Church, for, while many and early attempts were made to introduce it in the Church, these attempts never succeeded until clerical profligacy reached to such a pitch, that the priests preferred fornication to marriage; *then*, and not till then, was Gregory VII. enabled to enforce a discipline which, more than any other, tended to the corruption of the Church, and the general demoralisation of society.

The Policy of Celibacy

Has already been adverted to, p. 206, but it remains to be shown that this discipline has no foundation in religious or moral objects. The proceedings in the Council of Trent sufficiently divulged that “Ecclesiastical utility”—an ecclesi-

astical phrase which always signifies the secular and political interests of the Church—formed the only ground of reply to the several applications which had been made to the Council and Pope for the restoration of marriage, instead of concubinage, to the priesthood.

In 1562, Albert, Duke of Bavaria, made such an application by his ambassador, who brought before the Council the universal licentiousness of the German priests, and pictured in eloquent terms the fearful consequences to the Church and society.

In 1564, the Emperor Ferdinand himself similarly applied to Pope Pius IV. for a repeal of the laws against clerical marriage, urging as the ground of his appeal, that all the clergy, with few exceptions, were public fornicators.

A still more urgent application came from the German priests themselves, supported by arguments natural, moral, and scriptural, which were all met on the part of the Council by the logic of policy and ecclesiastical utility, a sample of which is subjoined from the account of the speeches delivered by some of the chief speakers, supplied by Edgar, in his *Variations of Popery*:—

“Cardinal Rodolf argued in a Roman Consistory in favour of clerical celibacy, that the priesthood, if allowed to marry, *would transfer their attachment from the Pope to their family and prince; and this would tend to the injury of the ecclesiastical community.* The Holy See, the Cardinal alleged, would by this means be soon limited to the Roman city. The Transalpine party in the Council urged the same argument. The introduction of priestly matrimony, this faction urged, would sever the clergy from their close dependence on the Popedom, and turn their attention to their family, and consequently to their king and country. Marriage connects men with their sovereign and with the land of their nativity. Celibacy, on the contrary, transfers the attention of the clergy from his Majesty and the State to his Holiness and the Church.”—Edgar’s *Variations of Popery*, p. 502. Lond. 1838.

Gieseler, the eminent and accurate Church historian, referring to clerical fornication about the same period, says,—

“In no century had there been so many decrees passed against the

concubinage of the clergy as the fifteenth; yet in none were complaints so common of their incontinence, which, in Italy, degenerated even into unnatural vices, as well as derision and lamentation over the inefficiency of all the means used to restrain them. The number of offenders made it difficult or impossible to carry into effect the more severe punishments, while the avarice of the bishops was easily gratified by substituting therefor (*that is, for the liberty to live in a state of incontinence, or keep concubines*) pecuniary mulcts, which soon changed into an annual tax! The commonness of the offence made it seem to the clergy a light thing; of course, the laity could not be expected to view it in any other light, and in consequence the vice increased to a fearful degree, so as, at the end of the fifteenth century, *to give birth to a new and disgusting disease.*"—Gieseler's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iii., p. 278.

Thus a remark already made, touching sacerdotal connection with the prevalence of the present-day great "social evil" of Christendom, is not only confirmed by this passage of Gieseler, but the great pathological evil of this evil—an evil which has physically corrupted and depraved a large mass of modern society—is here actually traced as to its origin to the beastly priesthood of the literal, as well as mystical "Mother of Fornication," Rev. xvii. 5, marginal rendering.

In the face of such evils, the motive for retaining this discipline of celibacy must have been great, and Gieseler supplies it in the following words:—

"There always continued to be intelligent men who advocated the marriage of the priests, *but the interests of the Hierarchy were too deeply involved in the question to expect them to yield.*"—*Ibid.*

The development and fruits of celibacy, however, are not seen in all their enormities, without a review of the second department of the Pope's official army, called the

Monastic Orders.

"His dwelling, a recess in some rude rock,
Book, beads, and maple dish, his meagre stock;
In shirt of hair, and weeds of canvass dressed,
Girt with a bell-rope that the Pope has blessed;
Adust with stripes told out for every crime,
And sore tormented long before his time,—

See the sage hermit by mankind admired,
With all that bigotry adopts inspired,
Wearing out life in his religious whim,
Till his religious whimsy wears out him."

The orders of the Church of Rome which impart the character and regulate the grades and duties proper to the ordinary clergy of the Church, are alleged to be derived from the apostles, and hence to associate the doctrine of "Apostolicity," or "Apostolic Succession." But the orders called Monastic have confessedly no apostolic warrant. They are an unmixed development without the semblance of either a precept or pattern, referable to the Scriptures. Bellarmin and some others, it is true, have tried to adduce the Scriptures, not to support Monastic Orders, but some peculiarities adopted in Monastic life, as the practice of Monastic begging from the example or life of Christ. Christ, he argues, had no possession of His own, nor any place where to rest His head, &c., and *therefore* He must have been a Mendicant. Of course it is quite unnecessary to heed such unanswerable argument; but the wonder is that his Lieutenant the Pope has not become a follower of Christ in this life of poverty, one of the three Monkish "Counsels of Perfection!"

The Church, then, has two systems of officials, like two systems of Tradition, the one apostolical, the other ecclesiastical, which she calls respectively *secular orders* and *regular orders*. The first, that is, the ordinary sacerdotal staff of the Papacy, are with great unintentional propriety called secular. They are truly a secular instead of a spiritual body. The regulars are so named because their devotional and domestic life are *regulated* in each order, not by the precepts of the apostles, but by a code derived from the originator or founder of the order.

The number and variety of these orders are legion. They are usually distinguished on disciplinary principles into two main branches—Monks and Friars, both embracing lay as well as priestly members.

The rules of the Monk confined his religious avocations as well as the reception of his domestic supplies to the

precincts of the cloister ; those of the Friars originally designed them for a homeless life, and gave them a roaming commission both to preach and beg. The two classes, however, afterwards came to be so much assimilated in habits and discipline, that the terms Monk and Friar have long been used indiscriminately.

Besides these two major divisions of the Monkish Orders, there is a third class called Canons, who form a species of intermediate orders between the secular and regular. Like the former, they are free from the vows and rules of the regulars, but they live together on the communistic principles of the cloistered Monks. Some orders of Canons finally adopted Monkish vows and discipline, and hence came to be formed a subdivision in the order, called Canons Regular and Canons Secular.

The several orders of Monks and Friars are now usually distinguished by cognomens derived from the names of their respective founders, or from local or other peculiarities connected with the origin of the order designated. In this way the most renowned, and we might say the almost exclusive order of the Monks are called Benedictines, from Benedict, their founder in the sixth century. The numerous Monkish confraternities distinguished by other names, are merely so many affiliated communities, for the most part observing the rules and discipline of this great parent order.

In the same way the four great orders of Friars are called respectively Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, and Carmelites ; the first three from the names of their respective founders, Dominick, Francis, and Augustine,* and the latter from Mount Carmel in Palestine, where the first Congregation of the order was established. The Dominicans and Franciscans are also respectively called Friars Major and Minor, and these and many other orders are further popularly distinguished by the colour or other peculiarities of their respective habits, as Blackfriars, (Dominicans,) Greyfriars, (Franciscans,) Whitefriars, (Carmelites.) These distinctions of orders, too, are applic-

* A pretended founder.

able to communities of Nuns or Female Monks, so that we have Dominican Nuns, Franciscan Nuns, &c., according to the rule which the sisterhood have adopted for their conventual life.

For a full account of the Romish orders, see Dr Geddes' *View of all the Orders of Monks and Friars in the Romish Church*, in vol. iii. of his *Tracts*.

Besides the particular code of rules proper to each order, Monastic life is regulated by three universal obligations designated in the system of Monastery

Counsels of Perfection.

All monkery professes to be founded upon the distinction between scriptural *counsels* and scriptural *commands*, and between personal *obligations* and personal *vows* to fulfil duty. Thus, under the text Matthew xix. 12, the Romish Testament makes the following comment on the words,—

“*He that can.* It is not said of the precepts—keep them who can; for they be necessary under pain of damnation to be kept, but of counsels only (as of virginity, abstaining from flesh and wine, and of giving all a man's goods away to the poor,) it is said: He that can attain to it let him do it, which is a *counsel* only, and not a commandment.”

And again, under Luke x. 42, we read,—

“For, to offer voluntary by vow (besides the keeping of God's commandments, whereunto we are bound by precept and promise in our baptism,) our souls, bodies, goods, or any other acceptable thing to God, is an act of sovereign worship belonging to God only, and there was never true religion without such *vows* and *votaries*.”

There is always an element of truth in Popish error. The devil could never have foisted the system so successfully upon humanity had he built up the Papal edifice with the materials of unmitigated falsehood. That there is some degree of distinction between a counsel and command is freely granted; what is denied is, that Popery has either rightly appreciated or rightly applied this distinction.

Again, it is true that vows were permitted in the Old Testament economy, but they formed no *positive part* of its

divine institutions. The practice of vows, like polygamy and slavery, was of heathen origin ; and Moses, like a prudent lawgiver, finding that more evil than good would result from a premature attempt to eradicate these deep-rooted plants of human error, suffered their existence among the Jews, until the Gospel should introduce the seasonable period and effectual means for their excision and removal. Accordingly vows have no place, either by precept or permission, in the New Testament religion ; and so far from being necessary or useful as an adjunctive help to the fulfilment of duties, their employment is indicative of defective, instead of perfective obedience. *It is a far higher form of obedience to fulfil a duty without a vow than with it.* That both the counsels and vows of Monastic Orders are Satanic devices to corrupt religion and debauch humanity, will be evident from a very brief notice of these Monastic obligations ; *to wit*, the obligations theologically designated by the Papacy—"The counsels of chastity, poverty, and obedience."—Council of Trent, Sess. 25, chap. i., *On Reformation*.

The Counsel and Vow of Monkish Chastity.

The term chastity, in this case, affords an additional example of Romish trickery in the delusive use of words. The skilful use of terms forms one of the most successful artifices in the science of priestcraft, and a principal cause of the success is the *little controversial notice* which this artifice has attracted. The vow of chastity is merely a vow against the liberty to contract *marriage*. It is simply a vow against wedded life, and has no reference whatever to chastity, as this virtue may be violated either by fornication or adultery, without the slightest violation of the Monkish vow. The following is the Canon of the Council of Trent on the subject :—

"If any one shall say that regulars having professed chastity can contract *marriage*, and that all persons may *marry* who feel that, though they should make a vow of chastity, they have not the gift thereof, let him be accursed."—Sess. 24, Canon 9.

Thus, while the Scriptures put chastity in opposition

to fornication or whoredom, and *never in opposition to marriage*, the Papacy puts chastity in opposition to *marriage*, and never in opposition to *fornication or whoredom*. Accordingly, in the present case, a Monk loses caste and incurs excommunication when he contracts marriage, but he never either forfeits membership, or incurs excommunication from his order, by any amount of fornication or adultery. The Papacy adopts the term chastity, professedly to express the obligations, but really to cover the violations of the vow so called. Every controversialist enlisted in the honourable and scriptural warfare against Babylon, should be careful to expose this policy by which the wily harlot would cover her own prostitution by the prostitution of scriptural and popular terms.

The evils of celibacy, shocking in the "secular order" of celibates, are vastly increased by the seclusion of cloistered life, as well as by the *earlier age* at which, according to further legislation of the Council of Trent, "regulars" are permitted to contract the vows of celibacy. The Council, in the heading of its chapter on the subject of age, says—

"Profession shall not be made except after a year's probation, and at the age of *sixteen* years completed."—Sess. 25, chap. xv.

But while it appears sixteen in the regulated age of profession, to accommodate the system to the most inexperienced girls, candidature and probation may be sought at a much earlier age, according to the heading of a succeeding chapter :—

"If a girl, who is more than *twelve* years of age, wishes to take the regular habit, she shall be questioned by the ordinary, (the bishop,) and again before profession."

Thus, mere children, with their constitutional instincts in relation to marriage undeveloped, and without the slightest experimental knowledge of the responsibilities incurred by the vows taken, are allured into those Monastic dungeons, and doomed to a life of morbid religion and pining slavery.

The counsel of poverty includes another example of that spurious application of terms which the Church of Rome has found so successful in the propagation of her principles. The poverty of the Monk is quite consistent with a participation in the most enormous wealth, and forms a very marked distinction between *sacred* poverty and *secular* poverty. The vow of poverty no more incurs the obligation of real poverty, than the vow of celibacy incurs the obligation of real chastity ! The vow is simply an engagement to sacrifice *personal* possessions in order to participate in *collective* wealth. The Monks think it better to acquire and enjoy property on the communistic principle, and the policy has proved so successful in times past, that an enormous proportion of the wealth of every European state came to be absorbed by these professed paupers.

Two other questions will readily occur on the wealth of monastic corporations—first, how this wealth was acquired ? And second, how was it used or expended ? Under each of these questions, history furnishes the world with materials sufficient to occupy the pages of many a volume. The answer of history with respect to the first question, however, may be summarised in a very brief sentence ; Monkish opulence was acquired by the most unbounded application of the well-known principle called *pious fraud*—the merchandise of masses, indulgences, relics, and a thousand other forms of swindling, including even pious shows or pious plays. For an interesting account of Monkish theatricals, called by the craft “Mysteries,” see Hone’s *Ancient Mysteries Described*. London 1823.

The wealth thus acquired was spent with a profusion and profligacy which has seldom been equalled in the history of spendthrifts.

“Crossing the Alps, (says D’Aubigne,) Luther had hardly descended into the plains of rich and voluptuous Italy, when he found at every step new subjects of astonishment and scandal. The poor German Monk was received by a rich monastery of Benedictines situate on the Po in Lombardy. The rent-roll of this religious house amounted to 36,000 ducats. The richly furnished rooms, beautiful dresses, and exquisite viands, all confounded Luther. Marble,

silks, luxury in all its forms. What a new spectacle to the humble friar of the poor monastery of Wittemberg!"—*History of Reformation*, vol. i., p. 67. Edin. 1847.

Of course, D'Aubigne's testimony is of no value in the eyes of the Romanist. Hence one is subjoined from their favourite advocate, William Cobbett, author of the so-called *History of the Reformation* :—

"The monks and friars had but one object in view, namely, that of living well upon the labour of others. This was with them the law and the gospel."—Cobbett's *Political Register*, Jan. 13, 1821.

So much wealth in the hands of professional paupers, was not merely a scandalous breach of the counsel or vow of poverty, but even long before the Reformation formed a ready apology for the civil rulers to lay hands upon Monkish treasures. Thus, in the retributive providence of God, the wealth acquired by the Monastic corporations became the very means *which led, and which are still leading*, to the *general overthrow of Monastic establishments*, in all those continental states where such establishments were formerly not only privileged but patronised by the civil power.

It is fortunate for the cause of truth that falsehood, and especially Romish falsehood, is always rich in the elements of its own refutation. We have seen the distinction drawn by the Rhemists between a *command* and a *counsel*. A command is an imperative duty; a counsel, an optional one. Thus, to *give* alms, belongs to a precept; to *beg* them, belongs to a counsel, recommendation, or advice—namely, to the counsel of voluntary poverty, at least to that counsel as professed by mendicant Monkery. Further, while to give alms according to the precept brings great merit to the giver; to beg alms, according to the counsel, brings much greater merit to the beggar! For while the first kind of merit may be acquired by the ordinary layman, and concurs only with ordinary holiness, the second kind of merit is proper to the counsel of poverty, and necessary to religious perfection, at least to the poverty and perfection of mendicant Monkery.

If, according to the preceding teaching of Monastic

Popery, to beg alms is a scriptural counsel, and more meritorious than to give them according to a scriptural precept, it follows that to obey a simple advice is more meritorious than to obey an imperative command!

It is almost an indignity offered to common sense, as well as to the sacred volume, to bring such teaching as this of voluntary pauperism and meritorious begging to the test of Scripture. But as Romanists themselves seek to support their absurdities by appeals to the Scriptures, it becomes a necessary duty of Protestants to meet these appeals—not to refute the teaching of Popery, but to expose their perversions of the sacred text.

Matt. xix. 21: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow me."

"Lo, (says the Rhemish comment,) He maketh a plain distinction between keeping the commandments, which is necessary for every man, and being perfect, which He counselleth only to them that will. And this is the state of great perfection which *religious* do profess, according to Christ's counsel here—leaving all things and following Him."

Every one guided by the sense of the text, instead of "the sense of the Church," (Creed of Pius IV., Art. 2,) can see that this counsel, or rather this command, "Sell that thou hast," was given by Christ to test the religious principle of a self-righteous devotee, who sought perfection by keeping the letter of the law, while his heart was a worshipper of mammon instead of God. Again, the perfection which Christ invited this young Pharisee to seek was not a perfection to be acquired by a compliance with the "counsel" to dispose of his wealth, but by the possession and exercise of that faith and obedience which were comprehended in Christ's command, "Follow me." Nor can this command to follow Christ include a life of Monastic imprisonment or Monastic obedience, unless it can be shown that Christ ever adopted a Monkish, instead of a scriptural, rule of obedience. Paul was certainly, after his conversion, a follower of Christ; for he calls himself so, and for that reason commands

others to follow him. And it is rather remarkable that, in giving this command, which he does more than once, he includes a special counsel to imitate him in adopting personal labour as a means *to avoid the practice of beggary, or living on the labour of others*. This counsel, too, is the more worthy of note by the Romanist, from the fact that Paul gave it by *tradition*, as well as by the written word :—

2 Thess. iii. 6. “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly and not after the tradition which he received of us. Ver. 7. For yourselves know how ye ought to follow us; for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you. Ver. 8.—*Neither did we eat any man’s bread for nought, but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you.*”

Thus we see how much Paul’s rule—that is, the rule of Christ which he followed—is opposed to the rule of a Dominick, a Francis, or any other of those Monastic legislators, whose fanatical followers so long formed the religious *Lazzaroni* of Europe, and devoured the industrial produce of Christendom.

The Counsel and Vow of Monkish Obedience.

Obedience is the first law of Popery; and an excellent law it is, where the obligations involved are regulated by equity, or by a rule securing the respective rights of ruler and subject. But the obedience required of Popery, and especially of Monastic Popery, knows nothing about rights. All rights are resolved into the principle of absolute and irresponsible authority; and to secure complete and unreserved subjection, every official in authority is judge of his own power in relation to the religious subordinate. Hence the doctrine of what is called “implicit faith,” and its consequent “implicit obedience;” that is, a faith and obedience rendered on the basis of *authority*, instead of *evidence*. In other systems of authority and polity, obedience is appreciated according as it associates an understanding and approval of the law by the subject. But the

peculiar quality which renders Popish obedience meritorious and acceptable in the eyes of authority is *blindness*; that is, stupidity or ignorance on the part of the subordinate in relation to the reason or righteousness of the rule he obeys. Further, this implicit faith and obedience not only exacts belief and obedience to authority *without* evidence, but *against* evidence—nay, against the evidence of those senses which constitute God's special witnesses in discovering to man the principles of both natural and divine truth. Hence the astounding deliverance endorsed and circulated by Cardinal Wiseman, who instructs the laity how to acquire and render this blind obedience in the following words:—

"To remove all judgment of one's own, one must always keep one's mind prepared and ready to obey the hierarchial Church, which is that of Rome! . . .

"That we may in all things attain the truth, that we may not err in anything, we ought ever to hold it as a fixed principle that what I see *white*, I believe to be *black*, if the hierarchial Church so define it to be!!"—*Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius*, with a Preface by Dr Wiseman. Lond., Dolman, 1847, pp. 173, 175.

With such a general principle of blind subjection to Monastic and other superiors, the counsel called the counsel of obedience, together with the vow to fulfil it, includes a twofold obligation—*first*, to render implicit obedience to the "rule" of the founder of the order; and, *second*, to render the same obedience to all officials above the rank or authority of the subjective party. These include a very numerous and graduated scale of functionaries, beginning with the lowest official in the monastery and ending with the officer called the "General"—a name given to the official who succeeds to the position and authority of the original founder, and who for political reasons is always obliged to be a resident of Rome.

In every department of hierarchial Popery, but more especially in Monkery, the "superior" assumes the position of a god in relation to his subordinates. Hence all infringements of his authority or rules are accounted *sin*, in the same sense as violations of the Divine law. A

rather interesting divulgement of this principle of Popery, which is one more usually concealed than avowed outside of Monastic or other disciplinary establishments of Popery, lately occurred in the case of *Fitzgerald v. Northcote*,*—a case tried in the Court of Queen's Bench, London. The defendant is a Jesuit Professor or Popish Principal of Oscott College, England, at which the youthful plaintiff Fitzgerald was a pupil, and received such ill-treatment as caused him to bring this action against his "superior." In the course of his examination Dr Northcote was asked—

"Pray, in scholastic discipline, as in moral theology, is there not a distinction between mortal and venial sin?"—(Laughter in court.)

"Yes, I dare say there is."

An answer which unwillingly conceded that disciplinary rules in Popery were put on a level with God's Moral Law, that all violations of these human rules are ranked as sins against God, are similarly classified into mortal and venial, and, of course, require similar penances and similar pardon by absolution. Thus in all the ranks and ramifications of the Papal hierarchial system—from the Pope down to the lowest official ruler—it is a pervading principle that the superior occupies the position of God in relation to his subordinates in the Church; fulfilling the scriptural mark of Antichrist, that he aspires to "sit in the temple of God, *showing himself as if he were God*," 2 Thes. ii. 4, *Douay Bible*.

The vow of obedience to Monastic rule being thus secured by sanctions proper to the Divine law, is further enforced by all that disciplinary vigilance and vigour which irresponsible authority can so fully exercise in the seclusion of

Monastic Prisons.

Self-incarceration being an element of Monkish obligation, and one necessary to Monastic perfection, it is not easy to see why the Church has neglected to constitute a

* See *Edinburgh Daily Review*, of 9th February 1866, for a notice of the trial.

counsel of imprisonment, as well as a counsel of chastity, poverty, or obedience.

In the constitution of the Papacy, monasteries are the disciplinary barracks for "the regulars" of the Pope's Ecclesiastical army. Hence one of the Pontiffs was accustomed to boast that he had forty-four thousand monasteries at his command. That there was something more than metaphor in this boast of the Pope, we know from the history of Monkeny written by Romanists :—

"War became not only a Christian but a Monastic service, and battalions of monks were seen covering with hair-cloth and harness the outposts of the West."—*Life of St Dominick*, by Père Lacordaire, one of the most eminent of the present day French priests.

The importance which the Church attaches to the security of her prisoners, especially in the case of nuns, is evident by the style of structure proper to Monastic abodes, as well as by the legislative provisions of Councils on the subject. The following is from the Council of Trent, sess. 25, c. 5, headed—"Provision is made for Enclosure and Safety of Nuns :"—

"The holy Synod, renewing the constitution of Boniface VIII., which begins *Periculoso*, enjoins on all bishops, by the judgment of God to which it appeals and under pain of eternal malediction, that, by their ordinary authority in all monasteries subject to them, and in others, by the authority of the apostolic see, they make it their especial care that the confinement of nuns be carefully restored wheresoever it has been violated, and that it be preserved wheresoever it has not been violated; repressing by ecclesiastical censures and *other punishments, without regarding any appeal whatsoever*, the disobedient and gainsayers, and calling in for this end, if need be, the *aid of the secular arm*.

"The holy Synod exhorts Christian princes to furnish this aid, and enjoins, *under pain of excommunication to be (ipso facto) incurred, that it be rendered by all civil magistrates*.

"For no nun after her profession shall it be lawful to go out of her convent, even for a brief period, *under any pretext whatever*, except for some lawful cause, which is to be approved of by the bishop; any indults and privileges whatsoever notwithstanding.

"And it shall not be lawful for any one, of whatsoever birth or condition, sex or age, to enter within the enclosure of a nunnery,

without the permission of the bishop or of the superior, obtained in writing, under the pain of excommunication, to be, ipso facto, incurred."

Again, in chapter 19 of the same session, headed, "How to proceed in cases of Pretended Invalidity of Profession," we read :—

"No regular soever, who shall *pretend* that he entered into a religious order through compulsion and fear; or shall even allege that he made his profession before the proper age, 'or the like,' and would fain lay aside his habit, be the cause what it may; or would even withdraw with his habit, without the permission of his superior—shall be listened to, unless it be within five years only from the day of his profession; and not then either, unless he has produced before his own superior and the ordinary the reasons which he alleges. But if before doing this, he has of his own accord laid aside his habit, he shall in no wise be permitted to allege any cause whatever, but shall be *compelled to return to his monastery, and be punished as an apostate*; and meanwhile he shall not have the benefit of any privilege of his order."—*Council of Trent, Sess. 25, on Reformation.*

British legislators may here see how little regard Popery pays to the civil law as it affects the personal liberty of the subject. The following analysis of the above enactments should be carefully noted by our rulers :—

1. A professed nun, however compelled by fear, force, or fraud to enter a convent, cannot leave it on any pretext whatever.
2. If at any time within five years of profession a nun wish to leave a convent, the application cannot be complied with until tried as to the validity of the reasons by the bishop or superior; these being empowered to *reject the application, and perpetuate the imprisonment of the applicant.*
3. If a nun, suspecting such a decision as the preceding, should succeed in escaping and evading the ordeal of this application and trial, she is to be compelled to return and remain a prisoner *without a hearing, and be punished as an apostate!*
4. If what are called spiritual censures—as excommunication, suspension, deprivation of privileges, &c.—are

not sufficient to subdue the disobedient, "other punishments"—that is, bodily application, as closer confinement, whipping, or torture of any kind—may be employed ; and if these fail, the "secular arm" is to be compelled to render its aid, in order to subdue and secure the refractory inmates of conventual or Monastic prisons.

Any political agitation, with a view to secure freedom to the captive nuns, is cleverly characterised by the sacerdotal gaolers of the Papacy as an interference with the free will and free agency of conventual inmates ; although the interposition sought is known to be in favour of, and not against, such freedom of will and liberty of action. That the whole conventual system is simply a money swindle has been amply shown by the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour in his pamphlet, containing his exposure of nunneries, and his refutation of Cardinal Wiseman's attempt to meet the accusations which that pamphlet contains. London : Seeleys, 1852. In this pamphlet, after alluding to the case of Miss Talbot, and her fortune of £85,000, to which the priests laid claim, he proceeds to say—

"I showed (in the lecture delivered in Bath, and which Cardinal Wiseman sought to refute) that every young woman on coming to a nunnery is called *the Bride of Jesus Christ*, and is expected to bring her *dowry* with her ; that that varies in different countries ; that, on my inquiries throughout Italy, I found that it extended from £300 up to £800 and £1000 ; and that in Ireland it was at the lowest £500.

"And I remarked that this (amounting in Italy alone to £4,000,000) was not a dead or inactive capital ; but that, as each nun died, her capital was available, being supplied (or replaced) by the dowry of her successor ; so that, if all the nuns died out in twenty years, the whole capital would be available in twenty years ; and if all the nuns died out in ten years, the whole of the capital would be available in ten years. And therefore, I observed, *there was a premium on the rapid dying away of the nuns !*"

Thus the nunnery trade is the evident source of all that zeal which the priests bring to the defence of those "ladies" over whom they profess to cast the *ægis* of their protection. The poetical fancy which describes the nun's

capital as a dowry given to Christ by his "spiritual bride" is neat and naïve-like in the extreme, and would not be further noticed here, except to expose the inaptitude of the priests' illustration and rebuke a malpractice of European society. We nowhere learn that Christ ever received or expected a dowry with his spiritual bride—the Church—or any of the spiritual virgins of her community. In the *East*, where the illustration in this case is to be sought for, the husband, with manly dignity, *gives a dowry for his wife*. Like Jacob of old he buys the wife, instead of the wife (as in the degenerate and ungallant practice of the West) buying the husband. So it was with the Divine spouse of the Church, who purchased His bride with the dowry of His precious blood, and never expected or required anything at her hands but returning love.

To ascribe the reception of a dowry to Christ is to impeach the disinterested dignity of His spousal relations to the Church ; while the metaphor employed by the priests to disguise their conventual robberies involves the perpetration of one of those exigetical blunders which characterise Popish attempts to dabble in Scriptural illustrations.

The rash attempt of Cardinal Wiseman to defend or palliate this dowry system called forth a rejoinder from the Rev. Mr Seymour, in which the Cardinal is made to bear convincing testimony to the delinquency of the system with which he was identified. This evidence was extorted from the Cardinal at his examination by the Mortmain Committee, already referred to in these pages, and embraced the following questions :—

"Is it the case that, according to the rules and regulations of the Canon Law, all such property as devolves on every nun, after becoming a nun, becomes the property of the community of which she is a member ?

"It would become *in Catholic countries*, and be recognised in Catholic countries, as the property of the (conventual) community ; but *in this country it is usual to make what is called a will beforehand*, and that is practically the rule pursued, to the best of my knowledge.

"Are you acquainted with the convent of New Hall ?

"I am to a certain extent.

“Do you think vows of poverty and obedience, such as nuns usually take, are in themselves sufficient to give the convent the right of the property, supposing no contract to exist before they entered the convent ?

“In that case the property goes to the convent, but in this country a nun is herself legally entitled to it; but by the laws of Roman Catholic countries, *ipso facto*, it is considered that the property goes to the convent.”

These important revelations and concessions of the Cardinal, analysed, testify to the following conventual rules in relation to property :—

1. In Catholic countries, besides the pre-paid “dowry” required of every professing nun, all her future acquisitions become the property of “the community.”
2. In Catholic countries, and in the absence of any legal instrument, either in relation to the “dowry” or to future expectancies, the mere fact of a nun taking upon herself the vows of poverty and obedience in connexion with any conventual order, entitles the order to all her property ; but as no such rule obtains in this country, the priests not only carefully secure the “dowry” by a legal instrument, but, according to the Cardinal, “to make what is called a will beforehand is practically the *rule* pursued.”

Those who wish for further interesting revelations on this subject must consult the pamphlet quoted. In the meantime the anti-scriptural constitution and character of Popish convents may be shown by a brief reference to

Scriptural Nunneries.

We are referred to Aphraim Chambers’s *Encyclopædia*, the first of its class, for the testimony of Borel, to the effect that—

“The name *nun* is derived from *nonno* or *nonna*, which in Italian signifies grandfather or grandmother, and was applied by way of honour to the woman, as that of father to the man religious.”

Remoter derivations of the word have been sought, but as the above refers to the original sense of the word in its *Italian* adoption, it, of course, forms the most satisfactory

derivation to the Romanist. According to the authority quoted then, the term nun (from *nonna*) primarily signified a grandmother; and hence, when it came to be applied in its secondary sense, "or by way of honour to the woman," its application was restricted to *elderly* women—it was employed with a deferential signification denoting matronly character and dignity. Hence its derivative, *nunnery*, would signify a *community* or *society* of such elderly females.*

In accordance with this signification of the terms nun and nunnery, the New Testament Scriptures make reference to two such nunneries or communities of elderly females, both originating under apostolic authority;—first, a community of widows,—

1 Tim. v. 9. "Let not a widow be taken into the number, (or community of widows,) within *threescore*. Ver. 11. The *younger women* refuse. Ver. 14. I will therefore that the younger women *marry*, bear children, guide the house; give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully."

The second scriptural community of these elderly females was the institution or order of *deaconesses*. The Scriptures are not explicit as to the *elderly status* of its membership; but as tradition is much better authority than the Scripture with the Romanist, it is fortunate that we have this evidence supplied by the testimony of the early Church, to prove that the female diaconal orders were not only nuns or elderly women, but *widows*, chosen in all probability out of the society of widows to which reference has been made.

The tenth canon of the Council of Laodicea, referring to the deaconesses of the Church in its day, calls them by the term *Presbutidas*, (elderly women,) to signify the matured age and matronly character of the women serving in this capacity.

* Like the term *church*, the term *nunnery* would also naturally come to be applied to the residence or edifice proper to the community.

Again, Calmet, an eminent Benedictine monk, and author of the well-known *Biblical Dictionary*, says—

“It is usually understood that at the first the deaconesses were widows who had lived with one husband only, *not less than sixty years of age*, which, by the 15th canon of the Council of Chalcedon, was reduced to forty years. St Paul says that Phœbe (the deaconess) had been his patroness as well as that of many others, Rom. xvi. 2, which implies a dignity seldom considered, and shows that great respectability was by no means inconsistent with the office of deaconess.”

Mosheim's testimony is to the same effect, and therefore need not be superadded. These facts, together with others respecting the subsequent history of the order, and the development of the Popish conventual system, supply grounds for a double charge against the Papacy: first, the gradual corruption and final suppression of an institution derived from apostolic appointment, and one of invaluable service to the Church; and second, the substitution of a female religious society, whose constitution and principles are not only without apostolic authority, but totally adverse to the character and object of the original institution. With reference to the first of these charges, it has been seen, according to the admission of Calmet, that the deaconesses were widows of sixty years of age. According to the same authority, the Council of Chalcedon, legislating against what the Church of Rome must regard as a traditional rule received from the apostles, reduced this age to forty years. This corruption of the apostolic institute, as might be expected, produced such evil results that future councils were obliged to seek their correction by new legislation. Instead, however, of restoring the institution to its original condition, the rulers of the Papacy simply made the evils of their own creation an excuse for suspending and finally suppressing the order of deaconesses altogether.

“In the Latin Churches as early as the middle of the fourth century, we find some councils setting the order (of deaconesses) aside. But it was not until the tenth century that it was wholly abrogated.” — *Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia*, vol. i. p. 536, art. Deaconess.

If the female deaconate was abolished in the face of apostolic authority, the nunnery system was established by assuming an authority which the apostles totally disclaimed. Paul expressly says, that "concerning virgins he had *no commandment* of the Lord," (1 Cor. vii. 25.) By what authority, then, has the Church of Rome gone about to create a conventual system, in which multitudes of virgins are imprisoned, ruled, punished, and even robbed of their cash, if not of their virtue? The answer is, by the authority of the Pope. But the rejoinder is, that if all authority is based on commandment, and if the apostle received "*no commandment*," and consequently no authority concerning virgins, how has the Pope come to possess what an apostle never received?

As the development of this female conventual system of the Papacy was collateral with and similar to the origin and growth of male Monasticism, the subjoined remarks on the rise and progress of Monastic institutions are chiefly referable to the latter.

Development of Monasticism.

Every error has its spring and growth within the mind ere it puts on the form of external action, and comes to possess an historical existence. Hence the subject of development presents the inquirer with a double form of investigation: that which relates to the mental influences—the springs of thought and feeling—which have given such errors an ideal existence; and that which relates to their practical introduction, growth, and establishment as theological elements of the Papacy. In the one case we have what, in the present-day phraseology, is called *subjective*, in the other, *objective* development.

As these pages are necessarily very limited in their historical references, the occasionally recurring remarks on Popish developments are chiefly concerned with the subjective or the *mental* or *moral causes* which have been concerned in the production of Popish errors.

The origin and development of the Monastic system may

be traced to various of these moral causes, of which, perhaps, the earliest was the principle of *self-righteousness*. Even as early as the second century this was the root of that abused distinction between commands and counsels which, as we have shown, was the practical foundation of all Monkery.

“In this century there was admitted, with good intention, no doubt, yet most inconsiderately, a fundamental error in regard to morals and pernicious to Christianity—an error which, through all succeeding ages to our times, has produced an infinity of mistakes and evils of various kinds. Jesus our Saviour prescribed one and the same rule of life or duty to all His disciples; but the Christian doctors either by too great desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or from a natural propensity to austerity and gloom, (which is a moral disease that many labour under in Syria, Egypt, and other provinces of the East,) were induced to maintain that Christ had prescribed a *twofold rule of holiness and virtue*—the one ordinary, the other extraordinary—the one lower, the other higher—the one for men of business, the other for persons of leisure and such as sought to obtain higher glory in the future world. They, therefore, early divided all that had been taught, whether in books or by tradition, respecting Christian life and morals into *precepts* and *counsels*.”—*Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, century ii., part ii., chap. 3.

The self-righteousness to which reference has been made, and which so much characterised the Jewish, as it now does the Popish apostasy, may be equally developed either by a desire to fulfil the *precept*, scripturally called “the works of the law,” or to satisfy the *penalty*, scripturally designated “the curse of the law.” The Jew sought to establish his own righteousness on the first of these principles; the Papist, led by the genius of his system, seeks the same thing on the second. As the direct design of the precept is to contribute to the order and welfare of the community or state, the Jew, with something like reason on his side, argued, that if by fulfilling the duties of the precept he contributed to the happiness of others, he thereby acquired a claim to be happy himself. But the Papist, with a greater blindness, arising from a greater abuse of Divine privileges, seeks to establish his claim to heaven, not by fulfilling the precept or discharging the positive

duties of life, but by discharging an amount of the penalty commensurate with his ability to bear it; his principle being, that the more he makes the present life miserable, the more he exalts the joys of the next!

A second moral cause to which the origin of Monkery is very distinctly traceable is *moral cowardice*. The Christian is called on to encounter a host of evils in a world of sin, and hence he is not only scripturally invested with the character of a spiritual soldier, but supplied with spiritual arms and spiritual armour to fight the battle of duty. The religious, like the secular poltroon, will show the white feather, and seek to flee, rather than face his spiritual foes. With the plausible pretext of escaping temptation, and ostensibly to cultivate, but in reality to escape, the severer trials of religious virtue, the moral coward resorts to the haunts of Monkery, and substitutes a spurious for a true renunciation of the world. "He (says St Antony, the early Monastic founder) who abideth in solitude, is delivered from the threefold warfare of hearing, speaking, and seeing, and has only to support the combat against his own heart." Thus while the Scriptures command us to let our light shine before men, the Monastic founder makes it a first principle that the light of his virtue must be put under a bushel, or only be allowed to shine within the walls of some Monastic dungeon. St James says, "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, that, when he is tried, he may receive a crown of life." St Antony says, "Blessed is the man who endures it not, and who escapes the trial which brings to the Christian victor the reward of glory." Nor is Antony's opinion respecting the value of the wilderness as a remedy against temptation so much to be relied upon, if we recollect that the devil seems to have a particular taste for the exercise of his power in this sort of locality. We have it on record that it was in the *wilderness*, not in the city, that Christ himself was specially "tempted of the devil."

Thus it was that not "knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God," nor even the power of the devil, the moral causes already adduced first peopled the deserts of Egypt

with those miserable fanatics of whom "Paul the Hermit" was the frantic forerunner—"the first monk"—the father and founder of

Individual Monasticism.

Monasticism, like other corruptions of the Papacy, thus developed itself in individual life before it put on those social and ecclesiastical forms which made Monastery so formidable an institution of the Papacy. The *Breviary*, or the priest's prayer-book, is a work which contains eulogistic accounts of the chief worthies of Popery. A brief extract concerning Paul the Hermit is here subjoined :—

"Paul, the founder and chief of the hermits, was born in the Lower Thebaid, (Egypt.) When he was only fifteen, he was deprived of his parents. To avoid the persecution of Decius and Valerian, and in order more freely to serve God, he betook himself to a cave in the desert where the palm-tree afforded him both food and raiment. He lived to his hundred and thirteenth year, at which age, and by divine warning, he was visited by Antony, (another hermit, in his nineteenth year.) In their interview, though they had never met before, they saluted one another by name, and had much discourse of the kingdom of God. *A crow, which before always brought to Paul half a loaf, now brought a whole one.* On the departure of the crow, 'Lo!' says Paul, 'the Lord hath sent us a dinner. Truly He is living and merciful. These sixty years I have received daily half a loaf. To-day He hath doubled to His soldiers the supply.'"

Such is a sample of the "old wives' fables," which every priest is obliged to read by canonical rule daily, or incur the guilt and penalty of mortal sin.

Numbers followed Paul and imitated his ascetic and frenzied devotions in the same uninhabited regions of Egypt. These were pure solitaries, each living in his own haunt and regulating his austerities according to the fancy of his individual or private judgment.

Tracing the development of Monastery according to its geographical transits, the system speedily spread from the deserts of Egypt to those of Syria and Palestine, where new motives continued to evoke new forms of Monastic life. The spirit which led the earlier monks to court the

applause of heaven soon generated a kindred passion for the *homage of man*—or a thirst for popular reverence on account of extraordinary feats of self-denial and ascetic sanctity. This passion speedily created a race of Monastic madmen, whose penitential exploits have thrown into the shade the most extravagant freaks of ordinary lunacy. As an example of this moral monomania we have only to refer the reader to history for an account of the *Stylites*, or pillar saints of Syria, (so called from the Greek *στῦλος*, a pillar,) who sought to astonish the multitude by their devotional ardour, and bring themselves nearer to heaven by living for years on the tops of pillars varying from six to sixty feet high !

This species of Monastic folly, being peculiar to the solitaries, received a check by the next stage in the development of Monkery. The social nature of man early triumphed over this life of solitary selfishness, and introduced those changes in the desert which gave rise to what may be called

Congregational Monkery.

The individual that inaugurated the social form of Monastic life was the renowned St Antony, whom the *Breviary* has already introduced to us as a disciple and admirer of Paul the Hermit. Antony for a time followed the example of his master, but at length, wearied with the experience of his individual solitude, he induced the monks of the desert to form themselves into social bodies. Numerous congregations were then formed, each living under a common roof, and on the supplies of a common purse. The *Breviary* thus introduces us to the second Monastic founder :—

“Antony, the Egyptian, was born of noble and Christian parents, of whom, when young, he was deprived. When entering the church he heard the gospel, ‘If you would be perfect, go and sell all that you have and give to the poor.’ He betook himself to the most desolate solitude of Egypt, where, daily advancing in Christian perfection, he despised the demons, who were the more eager in attacking him the stronger he was to resist.

“So formidable was he to the demons that many, agitated by

them, calling on the name of Antony, were delivered; and so great was his sanctity that Constantine the Great and his sons, by letters, requested his prayers. After reaching his hundred and fifth year, when he had innumerable imitators of his institute, having called together the monks, and instructed them in the perfect rule of the Christian life, he departed to heaven, illustrious by sanctity and miracles, on the 16th of the kal. of February."—Office for 17th Jan., in *Breviary*.

The patronage of Antony by the Roman Emperor was a subsequent cause of much weakness to Rome, if not of the overthrow of the empire. The passion for monkery thus fostered by imperial countenance, soon grew to such a height as to largely rob the empire of those able-bodied subjects from which the Roman army was wont to be recruited.

Antony's Monastic societies were congregational or independent. It does not appear that he ever became the author of a "rule" to any of the Monastic associations which he was instrumental in forming, beyond the regulations necessary to transform the solitary into the social principle of Monkery. The further advancement of combining several congregations under one polity and one rule of devotional and disciplinary exercises, is ascribed to his disciple and successor in office, Pachomius, who thus initiated the next stage of Monastic development, viz. :—

Denominational Monkery, or Monkish Orders.

St Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, in the latter half of the fourth century, was the first who originated a distinct denomination or order of monks. Having already found within his diocese a number of individuals of varied Monastic habits, he brought them under organic union, supplied them with a rule, and, as it is alleged, introduced for the first time the system of votive obligation—or the vows of "chastity, poverty, and obedience," which ever after came to form the general distinctive badge of the Monastic profession. The rule and order of St Basil became exclusively prevalent in the East, and to this day the monks of the Greek Church are all the followers of this order.

So far the development of Monkery was all but exclusively confined to Eastern territory and the Eastern Church; but in the year 341 the celebrated St Athanasius, having become acquainted with St Antony, became an admirer of the "New Philosophy," as it was called, and during his compulsory stay in the city of Rome, he there formed a Monastic congregation, and thus laid the foundation for the vegetation and growth of the Monastic superstition in Western soil. At first the rule of St Basil was adopted in the Western as well as the Greek Church, but as already noticed, St Benedict, a native of Nursia, near Rome, introduced a new rule and a new order of monks in the eighth century, which afterwards became as generally and exclusively prevalent in the West as the rule and order of Basil were in the East. As noticed before, innumerable affiliated orders sprang from the Benedictine prototype, the rule of Benedict still forming the general basis of the new formulas which came to be introduced by a swarm of new Monastic founders.

Rivalry between the Regular and Secular Orders.

The higher professions of sanctity made by the monkish orders, and ostentatiously exhibited by their bodily macerations and mortifications, came to despoil the secular clergy of much of that popular reverence which they had once exclusively enjoyed. Hence, a rivalry sprang up between the regular and secular orders, which their ecclesiastical relations did not serve to pacify or moderate. According to these relations, the bishop of every diocese assumed the exercise of an official oversight and authority over the monasteries within his ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In consequence of the rivalry referred to, this Episcopal jurisdiction was exercised with an amount of oppressive authority, which caused the Monastic orders to become insubordinate in the same degree as the seculars became unbearing and tyrannical. As a matter of course, the collisions between the rival aspirants for popularity and power soon brought parties into appellate communication with the Pope. The Pope had long been wishing to reduce the degree of inde-

pendent authority claimed and exercised by the bishops, and soon saw that his patronage of the Monastic orders would precisely serve his object, by weakening that of the Episcopal orders. Guided by the worldly wisdom which characterises the genius of the Papacy, the maxim "divide and govern" was industriously put in practice, until the Pope succeeded in reducing both parties to his authority. The monks were then liberated from the power of the bishops and made immediately subject to the authority of the "Apostolic See." Under the Pope's jurisdiction, the monastic system was gradually moulded to the interest of the Papacy. Henceforth, new Monastic founders were compelled to seek the approbation and charter of the Papacy, in order to the introduction and establishment of any new order; the Pope of course being careful to withhold all Monastic patents except such as favoured his own progress to political power. With the right to authorise and establish new orders, the Pope included the power to suppress old ones. So that having thus obtained entire control over all the Monastic orders, new and old, he soon moulded them into a political agency, which has long proved the most zealous and efficient support of the Papacy.

Under the immediate patronage and control of the Pope, Monasticism continued to develop itself in new phases; the next, and one of the most remarkable of which were a class of saints, who formed themselves, or rather were formed by the Pope, into a species of monkish militia, called

Military Orders.

One would have thought that the union of such opposite professions as the monk and the soldier was a most unlikely connection to occur in the official ranks of a Church professing to have an exclusive commission to preach the gospel of peace, and to wean man from the pursuits of war as well as the pursuits of sin. But the Papacy is endowed with a power to develop the most extravagant novelties, and embrace the most opposite qualities, in the name of religion.

The Church is free to amalgamate sin and sanctity, and of course is equally free to manufacture an order of martial monks. Long before the development of this Monastic soldiery, numbers among both the secular and regular clergy united the military with the ecclesiastical profession.

A work of character, referring to these habits in feudal times, says :—

“Many of them were noted for the profligacy of their manners, most of them were engaged in occupations which the lay barons pursued, including not only the chase but warlike exploits,—nay, some *led the lives of freebooters*. Councils were held in 567 and 579 expressly for the removal of two bishops who had been *captains of banditti*. The first of these councils deposed them, but the Pope upon appeal *restored them!*”—*Political Philosophy*, published under the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Edit. 1842, p. 388.

The warlike spirit thus developed in the officials of the Papacy, resulted in the formation of an organised militia at the period of the Crusades, when there arose in quick succession numerous orders of military monks, or monks uniting Monastic vows with the military profession. The principal of these were the *Order of St John of Jerusalem*, sometimes called the Knights of the Hospital, or the Hospitallers, the *Order of Templars*, and the *Teutonic Order*. These orders, so long as they retained any prominence in the world, greatly redeemed the character of general Monastery. Instead of Monastery sanctifying the profession of the soldier, the profession of the soldier sanctified the profession of Monastery. So that in everything like moral conduct and social duties, the military orders were a great improvement upon the beastly herds who lived lives of laziness and debauchery in the Monastic stews of the twelfth century. At this period, this profligacy of the monks became so universal and public, that the Papacy itself was obliged to introduce an attempt at reformation, by licensing a class of new Monastic professors, called

Mendicant Orders.

As already several times explained, the formal vow of poverty taken by monkish orders, only excluded the possession of

personal property, while it allowed the fullest participation in wealth on the corporate or communistic principle. By this artifice the monks became so expert in the acquisition of collective wealth, that almost every monastery was gorged with plunder, and such unbounded possessions became the natural source of the equally unbounded profligacy which characterised Monkery at the close of the twelfth century. Hence the mendicants—two new orders which originated almost simultaneously at the beginning of the thirteenth century, under their respective founders, St Dominick and St Francis—adopted a rule renouncing all secular possessions, whether personal or communistic, and agreed to depend for their temporal existence or supplies on the practice of begging.

Innocent III., the reigning Pope, having sagacity to see in this new development a new source of strength to the Papacy, speedily gave these orders an authorised existence, and even employed them in the special service of the papedom. The Dominicans were charged and chartered with a controversial commission against heresy, which began to be specially troublesome to the Church at this time,—the period of the Waldensian movement. The Dominicans received at first simply a preaching commission, but Innocent subsequently employed them in the more effectual defence of the Church by the arm of *the Inquisition*. While the Dominicans were thus appointed to the special resistance of heresy, the Franciscans were appointed to the equally important service of propagating the faith of the Papacy, or of giving a broader and deeper foundation to the superstitions already developed and established in the Church.

But these new attempts at reforming the Monastic system, like all preceding ones, were doomed to experience a failure in the objects for which they were respectively originated and organised. Both societies, like all preceding forms of Monkery, speedily found means to violate their Monastic vows, and become rich in the profession of poverty, as well as profligate in the profession of piety. As some one has not less truly than wittily said, “they preached against worldly possessions in order to acquire

them, and preached up spiritual goods in order to dispose of them." By these means such immense wealth was speedily acquired by the immediate followers of Dominick and Francis, that numerous affiliated orders sprung up; thousands adopted the profession of Monastic begging, and the face of Christendom was suddenly darkened with such swarms of holy mendicants, that the Pope (Gregory X., in the year 1272,) was once more obliged to interfere, and attempt a correction of the abuse, by suppressing a great number of the mendicant orders, and reducing the rest to four orders, namely, the two original orders of Dominick and Francis, and two of the affiliated ones, the Carmelites and the Augustinians. See Waddington's *History of the Church*, p. 393, 1833.

That the new attempt to correct the new abuses as signally failed as any of the preceding, will be seen by a brief quotation from the historian referred to, touching the character of the mendicants, not only acquired at their very commencement, but retained in their most reformed condition.

"No long time elapsed from their origin, before the reproach of corruption was commonly and justly cast upon them. General complaints arose respecting the multitude of prettexts which they invented for the extortion of money; respecting the vagabond habits, the idleness and importunity of many among them. It was particularly asserted, that having insinuated themselves into the confidence of families, they *took under their special charge the management of wills, and constructed them to their own advantage*. They became perpetual attendants on the deathbed of the rich. Moreover they engaged with intriguing activity in *the political transactions of the day*, and were intrusted with the conduct of difficult negotiations. The cabinets of princes were not too lofty for their ambition, the secrets of domestic life were not beneath their avarice.

"They thus became rich indeed, and they became powerful; but there were those who did not fail to contrast the contempt of worldly glory which illustrated the birth of their order, with the pomp which they afterwards assumed so willingly; and to remark, that through the abandonment of every possession, they possessed everything, *and were more opulent in their poverty than the most opulent*."

But "every evil has a soul of good;" this pomp and

profligacy of the mendicants, by the overruling wisdom of Providence, was remotely the source of a more effectual reformation than any which had been attempted by the tinkering efforts of the Papacy. The conduct of the mendicants so excited the indignation of the secular orders of the Popish clergy in England, that the quarrels of the two parties led to the first movements towards the Reformation in England, or rather in the world, under the leadership of the immortal Wickcliffe.

The Reformation, however, still tarried. While Providence appears to have ordained that every evil involves the principle of its own destruction; the destructive process does not appear to begin until the evil reaches the *climax of its development*. The Monastic system is the highest development of Popish corruption, and out of the last and loftiest branch of the Monastic tree—the Augustine Order—came forth that vigorous sappling which the hand of Providence employed to inflict the first destructive blow on the Popish system. These blows of the Augustinian monk threatened the total demolition of the Papal fabric, when the dismayed and faltering ranks of the Mystery of Iniquity once more rallied under the able generalship of Loyola, and the well-handled weapons of his new order, the

Order of the Jesuits.

As there is no institution of Popery, unless we except the popedom itself, which associates more important secular relations than the order of the Jesuits, a knowledge of the origin, characteristics, and career of this society is specially requisite in the study of social and political Romanism. If Monkery is the highest development of those elements which go to constitute the genius and characteristics of popery, and Jesuitism is the highest development of Monkery, then Jesuitism may be regarded as the quintessence of general Romanism—an abstract containing all the elements of the general system in the most intensified and concentrated form. To employ a familiar illustration—what the cream is to the skimmed milk, or what strong ale is to small beer—Jesuitism is to general Popery.

The *name* Jesuit literally signifies a follower of Jesus. We read of those who "called evil good and good evil, put darkness for light and light for darkness, bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter," (Isa. v. 20.) It is after this rule of verbal perversion that a society whose principles and practice have long entitled them to be called the *followers of Judas*, profanely style themselves the followers of Jesus. It is this rule which accounts for the fact that while the name Jesus is odorous of sanctity, the name Jesuit is a foul term significant of cunning, perfidy, treachery, and every species of demoralised principle and practical wickedness.

Origin and Object of the Order of Jesuits.

It is scarcely necessary to inform the present-day reader that this pestilent and fearful association owes its origin to Ignatius Loyola, the son of a Spanish nobleman, born in the year 1491, that he became an officer of the Spanish army, and that in this vocation being wounded at the battle of Pampeluna, and thus disabled from further military service, he resolved to exchange the material for the spiritual sword, and to place himself at the head of a religious militia for the propagation of "the faith." The period in which this resolution was formed was highly seasonable in relation to the wants of the Church of Rome. The Reformation had just then commenced, and it cannot be denied that the newly-formed society constituted one of the most effective means of resisting the progress of that movement which for a time threatened the total overthrow of the Papacy. The enterprises of Luther and Loyola being thus all but precisely simultaneous as well as mutually antagonistic, (the one having commenced in 1517, the other 1521,) Romanists think they see a special Providence in having thus raised up a champion whose antecedents and genius in every way qualified him to take the field against the advancing ranks of the Reformation. Under the influence of this idea, the earliest historian of the order of the Jesuits has supplied us with a contrastive picture of the two leaders—Luther and

Loyola—from which a few of the comparisons drawn are subjoined :—

“ Luther, with consummation of wickedness, openly declared war against the Church : Ignatius, wounded in the fortress of Pampe-luna, renovated and strengthened by his accident, raised the standard in defence of religion.

“ Luther attacks the chair of St Peter with abuse and blasphemy : Ignatius is miraculously cured by St Peter* in order to become its defender.

“ Luther, tempted by rage, ambition, and lust, abandons the religious life : Ignatius, eagerly obeying the call from God, quits the profane for the religious life.

“ Luther, with guilt of sacrilege, contracts an incestuous marriage with a virgin of the Lord : Ignatius binds himself in the vow of perpetual continence.

“ Luther despises all authority of superiors : the first precept of Ignatius, full of Christian humility, is to submit and obey.

“ Luther, like a madman, declaims against the Apostolic See : Ignatius everywhere undertakes its defence.

.

“ The sacrifice of the Mass, the Eucharist, the Virgin Mother of God, the guardian angels, and the indulgences of popes, which Luther attacks with so much fury, are the objects which Ignatius and his companions exert themselves continually to celebrate by *new inventions* and indefatigable industry.

“ To Luther, that disgrace of Germany, that epicurean swine, that curse of Europe, that monster destructive to the whole earth, hateful to God and man, &c. ; God in His eternal decree has opposed Ignatius.”

Considering the source from which these comparisons have proceeded, of course the Protestant reader will regard them as highly complimentary to the immortal champion of the Reformation. The battle inaugurated by the two chiefs was simply a renewal of the old war in which—

Rev. xii. 7. “ Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels.”

* His biographers say that some time after receiving his wound, “ the Prince of the apostles appeared to him in a vision and touched him, whereby he was, if not immediately restored to health, at least in a fair way of recovery.”

Ignatius, like other Monastic founders, naturally desired to frame the constitution and principles of the new order both in accordance with the predilections of his own genius and the object of its formation. That the personal influences which served to modify his views were chiefly derived from his prior secular avocations is admitted by all the historians of the order, among whom Criteneau Joly (one approved by the Jesuits themselves) writes :—

“As the mind of Ignatius was filled with military ideas, he figured to himself Christ as a general fighting for the divine glory, and calling on all men to gather under his standard. Hence sprang his design to form an army of which Jesus should be the chief and commander; the standard inscribed being, *Ad majorem Dei gloriam*.”

Ignatius, however, was not merely a soldier but a courtier, early initiated in the polished refinements of his hereditary caste, and thus—

“Bred in the court and the camp, he continued to combine the *finesse* of the one, and the discipline of the other, with the sanctity of a religious community.”—*Pascal's Provincial Letters*, by Dr M'Crie, Introduction, p. 21.

These predilections, together with the object of his proposed society, determined Ignatius to give it a constitution diverse from all other Monastic institutes. Notwithstanding the high prestige and the veneration which had been so long and so lavishly bestowed upon the Monastic system, he had sagacity to see that the general principles of that system were fundamentally erroneous, and that all the existing orders were only so many communities of devotional drones whose time and energies were spent in rounds of frivolous mummeries, totally incompatible with the worldly and practical activity necessary to advance the interest of religion in his own sense of the term. Hence Ignatius determined to constitute his proposed order with an entire departure from those prior systems of Monastery, which all experience had pronounced to be so many failures, and which he must have known had even engendered in the Church the majority of those evils that

formed a principal cause of that reform movement he proposed to encounter and repel.

Institution and Establishment of the Jesuits.

Ignatius having matured a rough outline of the principles which he designed for his society, proceeded to Rome to seek the necessary charter for its organisation from the reigning Pontiff, Paul III. Paul, however, either because he had sufficient experience of monkish orders to know that their multiplication was not likely to bring any additional credit to the Church, or because of the novel and peculiar principles of the proposed constitution, at first directly refused the application made for a charter. But the exigencies of the Papacy at the time ultimately caused the Pontiff to listen to a proposition which led him to hope that the instrumentality of the new order might be made available for the revival of despotism and Popery, and the successful resistance of the Reformation. Hence, after much perseverance, Ignatius succeeded in removing the Pontiff's objections, and obtained the necessary licence for his new order, on condition that the society to be formed should supplement the usual three Monastic vows with a *fourth vow, binding the society to an unreserved subjection to the authority and service of the Pope*. This fourth vow, therefore, forms a special constitutional peculiarity of the Jesuit order, and is the source of all those distinctive privileges which Paul granted in chartering the order by his Bull, bearing date 27th September 1540, and beginning with the words—*Regimini Militantis Ecclesiae*.

Under the provisions of this Bull, and the regulations of the "Constitution" which he framed for the government of the new order,* Ignatius speedily set about the organisation of the society which, according to the Constitution to which reference has been made, he divided into four classes,—*the Novitiates, Scholars, Coadjutors, and Professed*.

* The Constitution in its present perfected state, is not the work of Ignatius himself, but of Lainez and other succeeding Jesuits.

The *Novices* are those put on trial for admission to the society during a *biennium*, or period of two years. Previous to the admission of any individual even to the position of a novice, the candidate has to undergo a strict investigation, conducted according to the rules of a work expressly compiled for the object, or for the examinations of the applicant. This work, *The Examen*, supplies the most searching inquiries touching all that concerns the fitness of the candidate in disposition and acquisition to answer the aims and functions of an official in the society. Having passed this ordeal, the candidate, if approved, is admitted to the *biennium*. During this period, which may commence at the age of fourteen years, he goes through a period of devotional and disciplinary training made famous by the celebrated work of Ignatius, called

Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius.

In a translation of this work, which has been edited in this country by Cardinal Wiseman, we have the most extraordinary display of morbid religious exercise, combined with the most profound knowledge of human nature, ever exhibited in the inspirations and productions of Popery. In Cardinal Wiseman's Introduction to the last edition of this famous work, we are told :—

“We will observe that the work is divided into four weeks, (of spiritual exercises,) and each of these has a specific object, to advance the exercitant an additional step towards perfect virtue. If the work of each week be thoroughly done, *this is actually accomplished!*”

For a full understanding of the design and tendencies of this work, which may be called the art of manufacturing a saint, according to the most speedy and effectual process in the system of popery, the reader must be referred to the work itself.

When a novice has passed through his *biennium* successfully, he takes the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, drawn up in a special form, of which the following is an extract :—

“Almighty, everlasting God, I, N., albeit every way unworthy in

Thy holy sight, yet relying on Thine infinite pity and compassion, and impelled by the desire of serving Thee, in the *presence of the most Holy Virgin*, and before all Thine heavenly host, vow to Divine Majesty perpetual poverty, chastity, and obedience, in the Society of Jesus, and promise that I will enter the same society to live in it perpetually, *understanding all things according to the constitution of the society.*"

It was by this last peculiar clause in italics that the Jesuits have been enabled to overreach the astute policy of the Court of Rome itself, and even to assert their independence of the power to which they had pledged the most unreserved obedience.

The second class, or *Scholars*. The novices are admitted at the early age of fourteen for educational objects, and hence they are chosen in the first instance with special reference to capacities for educational culture. When this is complete, the novice passes into the rank of the scholars, and after a similar apprenticeship in this second stage he enters

The third class, or *Coadjutors*. Here a division is made in the members which have passed through the previous classes—into *temporal* and *spiritual* coadjutors. The temporal coadjutors, however learned they may be, are never admitted to "holy orders;" the spiritual coadjutors are all priests. This, however, does not prevent the temporal officials from exercising many functions properly clerical,—for even a novice may preach or hear confessions—nor the spiritual coadjutors from exercising offices properly temporal,—for the offices of scholastic instructors are not only exercised by the Jesuit priesthood, but *exclusively so*. The coadjutors are confirmed in their position by a renewal and modification of the previous vow, and then such as are priests are transferred into

The order of the *Professed*. The professed alone, which according to the constitution must be priests above twenty-five years of age, of course constitute the flower and soul of the Jesuit system, and in some sense are the exclusive order of the Jesuits, as they alone take the fourth vow, or the vow of Papal allegiance, which constitutes the special Monastic distinction of the order. The ceremonial

by which a spiritual coadjutor is admitted into the corporation of the professed, is made more than usually elaborate and impressive, and includes a reiteration of the previously taken vow in a new and modified form, pronounced in the presence of the general or vice-general, and of which the following are a few words :—

“I, N., make profession and promise Almighty God, before His Virgin Mother, and before all the heavenly Host, and before all bystanders, and you, Reverend Father-General of the Society of Jesus, *holding the place of God*, and your successors, (or you Reverend Father Vice-General of the Society of Jesus, and of his successors, *holding the place of God*,) perpetual poverty, chastity, and obedience, and therein *peculiar care in the education of youth*, according to the form of living contained in the apostolic letters of the Society of Jesus and in its Constitutions. Moreover, I promise special obedience to the Pope,” &c.

“To all these,” according to the excellent work of Duller, “should be superadded a sixth description of Jesuits, denominated *affiliated* or *adjuncts*,—more familiarly, ‘Jesuits in short coats.’ This class includes all ranks, not excepting the very highest ; and being wholly unsuspected of any connection with ‘the Society of Jesus,’ they are for that very reason capable of affording the most important service in promoting its secret designs, in return for which they enjoy all those pretended spiritual favours, of which, according to Jesuit theory, the mere entrance into the order, accompanied by a vow of blind obedience to its behests, secures possession, including of course that grace which Jesuitism professes to bestow on all its members—full forgiveness of sin, and the assurance of eternal happiness after death—an assurance which cannot fail to aid as a powerful stimulant to men of credulous minds and an unquiet conscience. *Hence the order has always had, and at this very moment has, at its command a countless host of such uncowed members, including statesmen, professors, officers, merchants, and even ladies.*

“Lastly, (continues Duller,) we must advert as belonging to the brotherhood in its widest extent, those numerous fraternised ‘Congregations’ or Associations into which are admitted men and women of every rank, for the avowed purpose of devotional exercises and the performance of works of charity, but which, being under the guidance of Jesuits, are employed with such effect in furthering the interest of the order.”—*Duller's Jesuits as they Were and Are.*

In consequence of the society having agreed to place themselves at the disposal of the Pope, it was released from all other ecclesiastical jurisdiction whatever, and chartered

with numerous other exemptions as well as positive privileges not enjoyed by ordinary monkery. The jurisdictional freedom and privileges thus acquired, sufficiently account for the extraordinary success as well as the extraordinary turpitude which, from the earliest period of its existence, began to characterise the proceedings of the new order. Unchecked by any authority except that of the Pope, liberated from the canonical offices, or the varied exercises of mechanical worship and ceremonial routine, which absorbed all the energies of other monks, the constitution of the Jesuits compelled them to devote themselves to those educational and secular accomplishments which they knew to be necessary to the successful prosecution of their professional aims. But as already intimated, the same professional liberties and vocational privileges which thus enlarged the professional capacities of the Jesuits, equally contributed to facilitate the perpetration of those social and political villanies which caused this society to be successively expelled from every European State. In other orders a capacity for crime is at least partially circumscribed by Monastic regulations, which limit their avocations to particular haunts, and to particular modes of action ; while the adoption of a particular dress both serves to distinguish them and to create circumspection of conduct in the wearer. But the Jesuit is freed from all such circumstantial impediments to the perpetration of crime ; he is privileged with a ubiquitous freedom of action ; he may adopt any disguise of dress, of occupation or profession, by which he may the more effectually accomplish the particular objects of his society, and this license of the society to pursue its avocations in masquerade is equally available in a corporate and individual capacity. After being expelled from France, the society surreptitiously returned at the Restoration under the assumed name of "Brothers of the Faith." In the reign of Elizabeth, the Jesuits employed incessant individual disguise to compass her destruction. The fact that Parsons the Jesuit acquired an entrance into England in a military captain's uniform is thus approvingly noticed by the *Roman Catholic Directory* :—

“Having provided himself with a military uniform *in order to personate* a captain returning from Flanders to England, he passed to Calais on the 11th June, and reached Dover next morning. Here finding all things propitious, and feeling that he was the object of heaven’s special favour and protection, he boldly presented himself to the officer whose duty it was to search and examine the various passengers, and finding him very kind and condescending, requested of him to delay as little as possible, as a friend of his, a *merchant*, was to arrive from Belgium in a few days, and he was anxious he should join him in London as soon as possible; at the same time he gave notice of all to Campian by return of the same ship which brought him over.”—P. 43, *Catholic Directory*, Lond. 1846.

When it is considered that the Jesuits Parsons and Campian (the first of whom escaped while the latter incurred execution as a rebel under Elizabeth,) were both originally graduates of Oxford and *professed* Protestants, there can be no reasonable doubt that numerous members of this order disguised as Protestant religionists are at this moment not only permeating general society among us, but are acting officially in our social institutions; are busily employed in pursuing the avocations of the order in spreading their pestiferous principles with a view of subverting the religion and the liberties of this kingdom, and in corrupting society by the spread of those horribly licentious tenets so notoriously contained in the

Moral Principles of the Jesuits.

The immoral practices of individuals in communities are generally the result of a departure from a creed or code of principles which confessedly condemn what is practically followed :—

“They know the right, and they approve it too,
Condemn the wrong, and yet the wrong pursue.”

So long as a standard of correct morality remains, there is hope that the contrary practice may be rectified; but if the standard itself be corrupted—if the rule of moral conduct be lowered to accord with the practice, reformation becomes proportionably hopeless—for the practice can never be superior to the rule which is professedly the standard of duty. Until the principles of the Jesuit be-

came the moral code of the Papacy, Romish immorality was simply a departure from the standard of rectitude which before then was to some extent theoretically preserved even in the Church of Rome. But the Jesuits accomplished the feat of reducing the moral code of Romanism to the level of its practice. The aim of the society has been not merely to destroy practical righteousness but to obliterate and pervert the rule by which righteousness could be either discerned or appreciated. Thus the Order of Jesus, or the Order of Judas, literally became "the enemies of all righteousness," theoretical and practical. The code of principles which have been culled from the moral teachers of the body, is beyond all comparison the highest development of "the doctrine of devils," by which the Papacy was to be distinguished. Testimony to this effect, to satisfy Roman Catholics, must of course be derived from Roman Catholics themselves. The most eminent witness in this case is the celebrated Blaise Pascal. All inquirers on the subject of Jesuitism need to be in some degree acquainted with the antecedents of that individual, in order to understand the character and merit of those inimitable *Provincial Letters* which first so effectually enlightened the world in the principles of the Jesuits, and became the remote cause of that downfall which the order experienced through the execrations of society and the repressive agencies of governments. These antecedents, so far as necessary for the design of the present work, may be thus briefly indicated. The Jesuits, knowing that Luther derived his early impressions of Protestant doctrine from the works of Augustine, bishop of Hippo, made the teaching of that father a special object of polemic disputation and disparagement. This caused Jansenius, the Roman Catholic bishop of Ypres, Netherlands, to defend the principles of Augustine against the assailants among the Jesuit doctors, and in 1640 he published the work entitled *Augustinus*, which first originated a great controversy, and finally a schism in the Papacy. The Jesuits, however, backed by the power of the Pope, succeeded in suppressing this movement, and the Jansenists

(or followers of Jansenius,) though constituting a formidable sect for a time, were ultimately extinguished. It was during the heat of this controversy that Pascal, a native of France, and one of the most distinguished philosophers of the seventeenth or any other century, having become a Jansenist, published his celebrated *Provincial Letters* from Paris, the letters being so called because they were written as if in correspondence with a friend in one of the provinces. This unanswerable work produced a rent in the ranks of the Jesuits from which they have never yet recovered. Pascal having thus attracted public attention to the works of the Jesuits, they were afterwards still more carefully scrutinised, and found to contain that class of moral teaching which evoked from Pascal the indignant queries: "Are they priests who teach them? are they Christians? are they Turks? are they men? are they devils?"—*Letter 14.*

As Popery always denies what it cannot defend in the system, as a matter of course the chief defence of the Jesuits against Pascal was of this character. At length, however, an incident occurred which produced public confirmation of the principles of the Jesuits as exhibited in the most authentic of all their own works, *The Book of the Constitution of the Society*. Among the privileges granted to the Jesuits by the Pope was a license to embark in any mercantile or manufacturing pursuit calculated to augment the finances or facilitate the professional ends of the society. The incident just referred to grew out of this privilege, and is thus referred to in the article on the Jesuits in Chambers's *Encyclopædia*. The writer is entering upon a notice of the historical causes which precipitated the European downfall of the Jesuits:—

"The first blow which they sustained was in Portugal. An exchange of colonial territory having been effected between that kingdom and the crown of Spain, the so-called 'Reductions' of Paraguay, in which the Jesuit missionaries possessed an authority all but sovereign, were transferred to Portugal. The native Indians having resisted this transfer, the Portuguese ascribed their disaffection to the Jesuit missionaries. The Portuguese minister, Pombal de Carvalho, to whom the Jesuits allege that their possessions in Portugal had long been an object of desire, instituted a commission of inquiry,

and while it was still pending, an attempt on the life of the king, Joseph, which, as in the similar attempts on Henry III. and Henry IV., was laid to the charge of the Jesuits, furnished him with a fresh ground of impeachment; and without waiting any judicial proof of either accusation, he issued in Sept. 1759 a royal decree by which the whole order was definitely expelled from the kingdom. This example was followed by other kingdoms.

"In France, under the ministry of the Duke de Choiseul, the immediate occasion of the disgrace of the Jesuits was a trial in the civil courts. Father Lavalette, as Procurator of the Order in the Island of Martinique, had consigned to a commercial house in Marseilles two large and valuable cargoes. These cargoes having been received by English cruisers, and Lavalette being unable to meet the bills which he had drawn upon the credit of their delivery, the Marseilles merchants proceeded against the order. The provincial Parliament having decided in favour of the merchants' claim, the Jesuits pleaded that Lavalette acted not only without the authority of the order, but against the private constitutions, and appealed to the Parliament of Paris against the provincial sentence. The inquiry thus raised presented an opportunity of which the ancient enemies of the order in the Parliament eagerly availed themselves. A report on the constitutions of the society highly damnatory was speedily drawn up, and a demand was made for the suppression of the order, as irreconcilable in its constitution and practice with the interests of the State and of society."

Referring to the same transactions, Nicolini, in his *History of the Jesuits*, p. 344, a work which should be in the hand of every inquirer into the principles and history of the Jesuits, thus adverts to the case of Lavalette:—

"But in 1761 a more decisive occasion was offered to the enemies of the order to ask for their expulsion, (from France.) Father Lavalette, the Superior-General of Martinique—a bold and unscrupulous speculator, a priest who by their own confession began to operate not only in the produce of the goods belonging to the house, but who purchased large properties and *bought two thousand slaves to work them*—was the means of creating this occasion."

Nicolini then goes on to relate the particulars contained in the extract already supplied from Chambers respecting the French Council, and then adds:—

"From the moment when the constitutions of this mysterious and dread society were brought to light—constitutions which had been kept jealously secret—all minor questions disappeared. Father

Lavalette, the bankrupt, the bankers, (who were never paid,) all were forgotten in the great question affecting the society itself. Dogmatic disputes which had so long been forgotten, now resumed all the force of present interest and all the attraction of novelty. There was a universal eagerness to discover and apply those mysterious constitutions. Women and even children were animated with the ardour of old practised lawyers. Pascal became the idol of the day."

Thus in the retributive providence of God, Pascal's exposure of the Jesuits received a public confirmation which stamped his work with veracity, and closed the mouths of the society. The distinctive moral principles of the Jesuits, to which the preceding remarks have been introductory, are contained either in the formal code of the society called its Constitution, or in the works published by individual members of the society, and which according to the rules of the Constitution can only be written or published under the sanction of the society itself. *The Book of the Constitutions* never saw the light until first published by order of the French Parliament in 1761, in connection with the famous trial of Leonci v. Father Lavalette. Since then, other editions have been published, of which one of the latest is that of Avignon, 1827.

As a matter of course, the grand leading principle of the constitutional code is "blind obedience" to the official orders, but more especially to the official bearing the military title,—“General.” Thus the constitution declares:—

“The member *must regard the Superior as Christ the Lord*, and must strive to acquire perfect resignation and denial of his own will and judgment; in all things conforming his will and judgment to that which his Superior wills and judges.”—*Constitution*, par. iii. cap. i. sec. 23.

And again:—

“Let every one persuade himself that he who lives under obedience should be moved and directed under divine providence by his Superior, *just as if he were a corpse*.”—*Ibid.* par. vi. cap. i. sec. 1.

Again, the obedience is so absolute that the Superior is entitled to *command the commission of sin*, for the advan-

tage of the society. This obligation is thus introduced in terms of apologetic blasphemy :—

“No constitutions, declarations, or any order of living, can involve an obligation to sin, mortal or venial, *UNLESS THE SUPERIOR command them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ*, or in virtue of holy obedience; which shall be done in those cases or persons wherein it shall be judged that it will greatly conduce to the particular good of each, or to the general advantage; and instead of the *fear of offence* [that is, which results from a conscious violation of the divine law,] let the love and desire of all perfection succeed, that the greater glory and praise of Christ our Creator and Lord may follow!”—*Constitution*, par. vi. cap. v. sec. 1.

Such are a few specimens of the *Book of the Constitution*. The works of individual Jesuits being simply expositions or enlargements of the general principles contained in the Constitutions, are still more explicit on the morals of the society. These works, as already intimated, are necessarily authenticated by the general body from the following rule of the Constitutions :—

“Whoever is endowed with the talent of writing books conducive to the common good, and shall compose any such, nevertheless *shall not publish them, except the General shall previously see them and subject them to the judgment and censure of others, that if they shall seem good for edification they may come before the public, and not otherwise.*”—*Ibid.*, par. vii. cap. iv.

This important constitution therefore secures the validity of all references which the controversialist may have occasion to make to the works of individual Jesuits. Happily the most conspicuous and pernicious of these works, as well as the Constitutions of the Society, were collected, examined, and condemned by the Parliament of Paris, prior to the expulsion of the society on the occasion referred to. The process of examination extended over a range of one hundred and forty-seven Jesuit authors of the highest authority, and their works were collated and the extracts from them verified by a Special Commission appointed by the French Parliament, and consisting of no less than five Princes of the Realm, four Peers, seven Presidents of the Court, thirteen Counsellors of the Grand Chamber, and fourteen additional functionaries. After this prolonged

examination, the Commission published the result of their labours in a folio work entitled *Extraits des Assertions Dangereuses et Pernicieuses*, &c., and presented to the king, March 5, 1762.

“To prove to the king the perversity of the doctrine constantly maintained, and without interruption, by the priests, scholars, and others, styling themselves of the Society of Jesus, in a multitude of works, reprinted a great number of times in public theses and in *Lesson Books for the Young*, from the origin of said society to this very moment, with the approbation of theologians, the permission of Superiors and Generals, and the eulogy of other members of the said society: a doctrine, the consequence of which would be to *destroy the natural law*, that rule of life which God himself has written in the heart of man, and as a natural result to *break all the bonds of civil society*, in authorising theft, lying, perjury, impurity the most criminal, and generally every passion and every crime, by teaching secret compensation, equivocation, mental reservation, ‘probability,’ and ‘philosophical sin;’ to *destroy every feeling of humanity among men*, by favouring homicide and parricide; to *annihilate the royal authority and the principles of subjection and obedience*, by degrading the origin of this sacred authority which came from God himself, and by altering its nature, which chiefly consists in the entire independence of every other power upon earth; to *excite in the hearts of faithful subjects, and above all of those who compose the French nation, most lively and well-founded alarms for the safety even of the sacred persons of the kings under which they have the happiness to live, by the abominable doctrine of regicide*; in fact, to overturn the principles and practices of religion, and to substitute in its stead all kinds of superstition, by favouring magic, blasphemy, irreligion, and idolatry!!”—Pp. 2, 3.

But besides the *Book of the Constitution* and the publications of individual Jesuits, the principles of the society may be derived from several works, which, although not written by professed members of the order, so much homologate Jesuit principles as to constitute authentic exponents of the system. Among the works which thus expound, and for the most part advocate, the doctrines of the order, those of the now famous St Liguori hold the first rank for authority. All his works have been declared ecclesiastically approved in the process of his canonisation. Those who wish to see the connection between the Jesuits and the Saint, and the teaching of both identified, may consult

Cases of Conscience, by Pascal the Younger: London, 1853.

The Jesuits perfected the science of Popish ethics by the famous, or rather infamous, doctrine of "Probability"—a rule of right and wrong, which presents an awkward theological relationship to the better known rule of Infallibility. It has long been the boast of the Church of Rome that her system embraces an infallible directory, both in relation to faith and morals. The rule, however, notoriously labours under the practical disadvantage of being only accessible when not wanted. Hence some additional or substitutionary guide had long become a necessity in the Church. To meet this want, the Jesuits, if they did not originate, at least matured and perfected, the system of ethics, which has come to be theologically designated the doctrine of Probabilism. The doctrine so called, although involving a great variety of casuistic distinctions, may be summarily comprehended in some such two or three propositions as the following—namely:

1. That when a Roman Catholic is unable to obtain infallible instruction on a dubious point of faith or duty, he must be satisfied with believing or acting on the principle of what is *probably* right or *probably* wrong in the case.
2. That what is probably right or probably wrong in the case must, as a rule, be decided not by himself, but by the judgment or opinion expressed on the subject by one or more fathers or doctors of the Church.
3. That if "even one grave father or doctor" decides in favour of the rectitude of an act or course of conduct, that one opinion is sufficient to make it probably right.

When "doctors differ," the system permits the layman to take his choice, provided he is guided by the principle of what is the *more* or *most* probable in the case.

Each of the rules—that is, of infallibility and probability—has its peculiar advantages and disadvantages. Infallibility makes a thing certain, but is nowhere to be found in the Church: the decisions of probabilism, on the contrary,

are always uncertain; but they are always accessible. The first has the advantage in theory; the latter in practice. While it takes "the unanimous consent of the fathers" to make a thing infallible, it only takes the consent of a single "grave father" to make a thing probable; and while no Roman Catholic has been able to procure the unanimous consent of the fathers upon any point, he may obtain the decision of one grave doctor on every point. See article "Probabilism," in *Chambers's Encyclopædia of Useful Knowledge*. In the meantime we subjoin

Selections from the "Probable" Decisions of Jesuit Doctors.*

"The authority of one good doctor is a sufficient reason on which to ground the probability of any opinion, so that everyone may safely follow it."—*G. De Rhodes, De Actibus Humanis*, 1, 2, sec. iii. 1.

"The spiritual power (that is, of the Papacy) may change kingdoms, and take from one to transfer to another."

"Christians may not tolerate an infidel or heretical king if he endeavours to draw his subjects to his heresy or infidelity; but it is the province of the sovereign Pontiff, to whom the ark of the faith has been entrusted, to decide whether the king draws them to heresy or not. *It is, therefore, for the Pontiff to determine whether the king must be deposed or not.*"—*Bellarmino, Extraits des Assertions*, p. 447.

This is the rule of the whole canon law on the political relation of Popes and Kings; and, notwithstanding the oath of allegiance heretofore taken by Roman Catholic Members of Parliament, and other officials under the British Government, this is the doctrine held by the Papists of this kingdom, as may be seen from a protracted correspondence in the *Tablet* newspaper of December 1857.

"A private man, whoever he may be, has a right equal to the best to kill a king declared (*i.e.*, by the Pope) a public enemy."—*De Rege et Regis Institutione*, p. 67.

"They only are to be accounted assassins who commit a homicide with the bargain that he who employs them shall pay them a temporal reward."—*Liguori*, iv. 364.

"It is lawful to kill him by whom it certainly appears that snares

* Some of the selections, it will be seen, prefer to give *certain* decisions; but they can only be certain in the opinion of the individual writers who supply the decisions.

are prepared to kill you ; as, for example, if a wife knows that in the night she is to be killed by her husband, if she cannot escape, she may *anticipate* him.”—*Ibid.*, p. 387.

“If you endeavour to ruin my reputation by false impeachment before a prince, a judge, or man of distinguished rank, and I cannot by any means avert this injury of character unless I kill you secretly, May I lawfully do it ? *Bannez asserts that I may.* . . . Still the calumniator should first be warned that he desist from his slander ; and if *he will not, he should be killed, not openly, on account of the scandal, but secretly.*”—*Extraits des Assertions*, p. 413.

“Servants are secured both from sin and restitution if they only take for *equitable* compensation—that is, when they are not furnished with such things necessary for food and clothing as commonly are, and in other houses ought to be, provided for a similar servant ; they only take so much of their master’s property as will compensate for such an injustice, and no more.”—Reginald, in *Extraits des Assertions*, p. 349.

“Servants may act on their own *private judgment* in compensating their own work.”—*Liguori*, iii. p. 246.

Here for once the Church of Rome allows “the right of private judgment ;” and the right being granted in this case, of course will be taken for granted in the various other cases where *morality* and not *doctrine* is the matter to be judged.

“It is certain that the Pope and his prelates can dispense with vows, since herein they hold *the place of God on earth.*”—*Liguori*, vol. i., 189.

“The power of dispensing belongs to all prelates who have jurisdiction *in foro externo*, or the privilege of doing so from the Pope. Hence the following persons can grant dispensations :—

“1. The Pope, to all the faithful from all vows whatever.

“2. Bishops to their own subjects.

“3. Exempt (*i.e.* from the jurisdiction of the ordinary) superiors of religious to their own religious and novices ; and this is to be understood of vows which they may have made either in the world, (of marriage, allegiance, &c.,) or in the novitiate.”—*Liguori*, iv. 256.

“It is asked if the Pope can ever dispense in things which are established by God of *jus divinum* ?

“*Ans.* In those things in which the *jus divinum* has its origin in the human will, as in vows and oaths, *it is certain with all that the Pope has the faculty of dispensing with them.* In those things which are absolutely and unconditionally ordained of God, (the law of nature, for instance,) Sanchez and many others say with great probability that the Pope has the power, in any particular case, not

indeed of dispensing with them, *but of declaring that the Divine law no longer binds.*

“The Pontiff cannot dispense with the law of God without a just cause ; but in any doubt about the validity of the dispensation it is to be accounted valid. *A dispensation may be obtained not only for a person in his ignorance, but even against his will.*”—Busembaum, 1, 2, iv.

“A confessor may affirm even with an oath that he has no knowledge of a crime revealed to him in the confessional ; meaning *as a man*, because the person who questions him has no right to any information which is *not to be communicated.*

“An accused person or witness, when interrogated unlawfully by a judge, may swear that they know nothing about the crime ; *meaning that they know nothing about the crime concerning which they may be lawfully interrogated.*”—Scavini’s *Moral Theology*, vol. ii. pp. 233, 235. Paris, 1859.

“Amphibology may be threefold—

“1. When a word has a double meaning ; as, *volo* means, *I fly*, as well as, *I will.*

“2. When the sentence has a double principal meaning ; as, this book is Peter’s, may mean that the book *belongs to* Peter, or Peter *wrote it.*

“3. When the words have a double sense ; one literal, the other spiritual. Thus, if any one is asked about something which he wishes to conceal, he may answer, *I say no* ; that is, *I say the word no.* Cardenas doubts of this ; but saving his better judgment, *he seems to do so groundlessly* ; for the word *I say* truly has a double sense—it signifies to assert as well as to utter, and in my meaning, ‘*I say*’ means *I utter.*”—Liguori, vol. iv. p. 151.

“It is certain, and *commonly held by all divines*, that with a good reason it is lawful to *make use of equivocation* in the ways above explained, and to confirm the equivocation by an oath. The reason is that we are not deceiving our neighbours, but, for some good reason, *letting them deceive themselves.*

“A witness interrogated by a judge, whether he have spoken with the accused or defendant, may deny it, meaning that he has not spoken with him by way of co-operation and crime.”—*Ibid.*, p. 160.

“It is certain a witness is not bound to tell the truth to a judge not legitimately questioning him ; he then may lawfully answer even with an oath that he is ignorant of the crime ; that is, in *such a way as to be obliged to declare it unto him.*”—*Ibid.*, vol. v. p. 265.

“Even legitimately and juridically interrogated, you are not bound to give evidence—

“1. If you learn the matter through confession.

“2. If you have heard it under natural secrecy.

“3. If, from your evidence, any notable harm threatens yourself or your friends.

"Is a judge bound to restore a bribe which he has received for giving a right judgment?"

"The answer is that he ought to restore it if he has received it to give a just judgment, when he has also an adequate salary, because he was bound to do right, and not to sell justice to whom it was already due. But if he received the money to *induce him to give an unjust judgment*, it is probable that he may keep the bribe."—*Extraits des Assertions*, p. 345.

This opinion, according to the "Extraits," is held and defended by fifty-eight doctors!

"A judge may, with the intent to serve his friend, at one time judge according to one opinion, and at another time according to the contrary opinion, provided only that *no scandal* result from the decision."—*Gregory of Valentia*, iii. 5, 7, 4.

"Those ignorant confessors are blamed who always think they do well in obliging their penitents to make restitution, *because it is at all times more safe*."

"A subject who thinks that the command of his superior exceeds the limits of his authority ought not to obey him."—*Schildere*, ii. 4, 55, 3.

"Although an opinion be false, any one may follow it in practice on account of the authority of the person teaching it."—*Guimenius, Tr. de Opin. Prob.* 1.

"To confirm an ambiguous expression with an oath is not perjury; because by that oath God is not called to witness a lie, since that is not a lie."—*Suarez*, iii., *de Jurament*, 9, 1, 2.

"When a man who has promised is from some reason free from the obligation of fulfilling his promise, he may swear that he did not promise.

"A man who is urged to do what he is not compelled to do may swear that he will, understanding (that is, contracting with himself,) if *I am obliged*."—*Sanchez in Decalog.*, ii. 3, 6, 7.

"The rebellion of an ecclesiastic against a king is not a crime of high treason, because he is not subject to the king."—*Sa, Aphor. Clericus*.

"If all the members of the royal family are heretics, a new election to the throne devolves to the state; for all the king's successors could be justly deprived of the kingdom by the Pope; because the preservation of the faith, which is of greater importance, requires that it should be so."—*Vasquez, Dup.*, 4, 5, 42, 169.

"The clergy do not belong to the king's jurisdiction."—*Gretser*, vii. 2, 3, 468.

"The clergy are exempt from lay power not only by human, civil, and canonical law, but also by the Divine law. A secular prince cannot punish ecclesiastics; therefore ecclesiastics are not subject to lay princes."—*Decastello*, ii. 1, 4, 8, 126, 128.

As a matter of course, the political and social perfidy and profligacy involved in the above and similar deliverances have been largely disowned by the members of the Church of Rome ; but that the followers of Loyola, as a body, have been ruled by such principles as those quoted is sufficiently evident from the fruits which have so universally characterised the

Acts of the Jesuits.

Regulated by such an accommodating system of morals as that exemplified by the preceding specimens of Jesuit teaching, the acts of the new-born apostles have been found in characteristic accordance with their principles. Those who wish to study the acts of the Jesuits need only make themselves acquainted with modern history from authentic sources. In order to facilitate this study, as a department of controversy, the proceedings and career of the Jesuits may be conveniently studied under a fourfold division, which will be found comprehensive of all the doings of these matchless “workers of iniquity.” In the prosecution of their special professional calling, these tools of the Papacy did not fail to conjoin with their missionary operations those educational, mercantile, and political enterprises which so largely contributed to the earlier successes of the Society. Each of the departments which have just been intimated—namely, the *missionary*, *educational*, *mercantile*, and *political* agencies of this Society—are worthy of separate study by those who would prosecute inquiry into the principles and influence of an association which constitutes the grand present-day buttress of an effete and tottering Apostacy.

The missionary career of the Jesuits is admirably treated by the Rev. Hobart Seymour, in his Exeter Hall Lecture of December 18, 1849, entitled, “The Nature of Romanism as exhibited in the Missions of the Jesuits and other Orders.”

The Jesuits, like other societies, are not less famous for the missionary operations abroad than at home ; and while many freely and unreservedly condemn the influence and results of their operations at home, they as freely and

unreservedly eulogise the efforts and effects of their labours in heathendom. These eulogiums, however, when applied by Protestant writers, are chiefly concerned with the temporal benefits brought to the shores of the heathen by the Jesuit missionaries. A large number of readers who have been led by such representations to form a very erroneous estimate with respect to such benefits, will find their views on this subject usefully corrected by a perusal of the able and impartial discourse referred to.

In explaining the principle of their marvellous success as religious propagandists, Mr Seymour shows that this principle simply consisted in "becoming all things to all men," with the utmost accommodation to human error ; so that, in order to induce the heathen to profess Christianity, the Jesuits, to a large extent, professed the religion of the heathen :—

"Seeing that the Chinese worshipped what in Scripture is called the 'Host of Heaven,' the Jesuits not only permitted them to continue this material and idolatrous worship, but *they themselves actually joined in it*, on the subtle plea that it was no more than tantamount to their worshipping that great Spirit whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain.

"To such an extent, and to such a gross excess was this carried, that the complaint reached even the court of Rome ; and after many a day of painful inquiry and anxious examination into the matter, the Jesuits were formally and by name *condemned in the Bull of the Pope*."—Pp. 35, 36.

Again, in alluding to their alleged establishment of a well-organised government in the very heart of South America, he admits their success as the originators of a civilised empire ; but then he shows that of this empire

"The *sovereign and chief* was the Father-General of the order of the Jesuits—the Jesuits were the bishops, and the very same Jesuits were the *generals* ; the Jesuits were the priests, and the very same Jesuits were the *colonels* ; the Jesuits were the confessors, and the very same Jesuits were the *magistrates* ; the Jesuits were the keepers of the conscience, and the very same Jesuits were the *keepers of the privy purse*."—P. 37.

Nothing can more significantly illustrate the "nature of Romanism." It is the very essence of that nature to rule

the temporal as well as the spiritual, and to rule the temporal *by* the spiritual.

This state of politico-religious propagandism was not always thus successful, as we learn by the reference to the operations of the Jesuits in Japan :—

“The religion of Japan had many analogies with that of Rome. The divinities of the Japanese comprehended a Mother and Son, precisely answering to Mary and Jesus—so precisely, that when the Jesuit St Francis Xavier sent a little image of the virgin and child to the Emperor, the Emperor kissed it, imagining that it was a picture of his own cherished divinities. But, besides this, the priests of the Japanese divinities were ‘forbidden to marry.’ They had a conventual system among them—convents of unmarried men, and nunneries of unmarried women; and they had religious processions, and they had lighted candles, and they had smoking incense. With so many and so curious affinities in the two religions, able and adroit men like the Jesuits found but little difficulty in persuading the Japanese that the two religions were, after all, but one and the same.

“At the moment of their success it was discovered that the Jesuits were secretly intermeddling *with the politics of the land, and actually intriguing for the overthrow of the native dynasty, in order to deliver over the whole empire of Japan to the crown of Portugal.* This naturally raised a storm of indignation against them and their religion, throughout the length and breadth of the empire. The fatal decree went forth; all the missionaries were expelled for ever, and every convert was commanded immediately, and on pain of torture and of death, to renounce Christianity for ever!”

Thus a whole nation, embracing upwards of twenty-five millions of most interesting inhabitants, were deprived of Christianity and European civilisation for upwards of three hundred years (or from the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century) by the political intrigues of a band of Jesuits. And even now, when American and Protestant enterprise have reopened Japan to European intercourse, the remembrance of Jesuit doings will doubtless prove an obstinate stumbling-block to the introduction of pure Christianity among the Japanese.

The extracts given from Seymour will doubtless be regarded as coloured by some. But the peculiar style of Jesuit missionary agency is not only attested, but forms a matter of some braggadocio in accounts furnished by

Papists themselves. The following extract is from the *Dublin Review* of April 1855, an eminent Romish periodical. The *Review* is supplying a critical notice of a work, "The Chinese Empire, by M. Huc, formerly Missionary Apostolic in China," and thus glories in a style of missionary tactics which a true apostolic missionary would certainly shun, as very distinctly characteristic of the devil's service :—

"The first step of the Jesuit missionaries, before setting out, was to exchange their Tibetan travelling costume for one better suited to Chinese notions; and *the principle by which their whole conduct was shaped* may be inferred from the fact that, being in all else attired after the newest fashion, (in sky-blue silk robes, and black satin boots with white soles,) they assumed the yellow cap and red sash, which in China are *the distinctive mark of the members of the imperial family*. The mandarins remonstrated against the assumption, but in vain. The travellers persisted in maintaining, as French citizens, their right of exemption from the customs of the country, and they carried their point; . . . insisting firmly when firmness appeared sufficient; *swaggering at times*, when stronger measures were needed; expostulating, threatening, and even *bullying*, when occasion arose."

Thus we have here a candid admission, at least, with regard to "the principle by which the whole course of a Jesuit's conduct is shaped;" and this principle of disguise, of "swaggering," and "bullying," is this moment being acted out in *the territories of Queen Victoria* with even more activity and success than ever attended its exercise in the flowery land of the Chinaman.

One more Roman Catholic extract is all we have room for. It will be found at No. 80, vol. xiii., of the *Annales de la Sainte Enfance*, a record of baptized youthful Chinese by Jesuit missionaries. Here is a specimen of their style of conversion—premising that the Jesuits in China, being allowed to assume all professions, the baptizer in the present case was practising as a *physician* :—

"Chinaman to the Jesuit.—'You are a physician. Come quickly; my child is dying.' Manuel (the Jesuit) hastened to the house indicated. A child, whose body was much swollen, was shown to him. 'There,' said he, (pointing to the forehead,) 'is the seat of the malady. The forehead is much heated, and must be refreshed. Bring a little water.' He touched the forehead again, and he *baptized the child without any one knowing what he was doing!*"

A knowledge of the educational tactics of the Jesuits is of the first importance at the present day. Unlike the old school of Papists, the Jesuits are intimately acquainted with the influence of intelligence, and hence are at present labouring with unceasing activity to acquire the command of the educational instrumentality in every state. It may be taken for granted that every association of the Papacy exercised in educational activity are Jesuits, whatever may be the name they bear. The following quotation from the late able and instructive work by Dr Wylie, entitled, *The Awakening of Italy*, will sufficiently illustrate the statement just made. The remarks of the Doctor refer to the Paoletti, or the Society of St Vincent de Paul, which, he shows, is but a Jesuit body, with a *nom-de-guerre* adopted to facilitate progress :—

“The Paoletti know how to open all doors, and to penetrate into the most sacred places. They belong to every rank of life, from the noble to the beggar. They practise every profession and every trade. They profess all shades of politics, and they wear every disguise. They are found in the bureaus of government, eating the bread of the state which they are secretly labouring to overthrow. They swarm in workshops; they insinuate themselves into the working men’s clubs; but *what delights them most, is to act as tutors and schoolmasters*. Their ambition is to mould the young, and rear a race in Italy that will be worthy of the dark ages.”

Those who wish to be informed how the Privy Council of this nation, by its Education Committee, are truckling to the scholastic schemes of the Jesuits, may consult the *Bulwark*, under the following and other heads :—

“Popish Tamperings with School Books,” vol. vi., p. 232.

“Privy Council School Books,” vol. vii., p. 72.

“Popish School Books and the Privy Council,” vol. vii., p. 176.

“Privy Council Tractarian School Books,” vol. vii., p. 225.

“Roman Catholic Educational Tactics,” vol. viii., p. 23.

“Rome’s Jesuitical Tamperings with Books of Education,” vol. ix., p. 151.

But, next, the Jesuits are a *trading corporation*, chartered by the Pope himself to carry on mercantile and other secular pursuits for the benefit of the society. Traffickers in spiritual merchandise were not very likely

to be very honest as secular merchants. Accordingly, as we have seen, it was the discovery of some gigantic "pious frauds" in mercantile transactions which first brought the Jesuits and their principles before the public, and revealed the true character of these "followers of Jesus." Every respectable history of the sect will furnish the student of Popery with the necessary information touching the mercantile enterprises and delinquencies of the Jesuits.

But while the Jesuits are equally at home in the avocations of the propagandist, the scholastic, and the trader, the sphere of *politics* is the peculiar arena in which they love to promote the interests of the Papacy and their order. It is here, too, that states have learned by the amplest experience that this society is a band of conspirators, leagued against every social and political institution which conflicts with the principles and designs of the Church of Rome. Hence the

Expulsion of the Jesuits from the several States of Europe.

The history of the society is remarkable for the uniform experience of every government as to the evils which the members of this conspiracy are sure to originate wherever they find a tolerated establishment:—

"No country could ever yet tolerate Jesuits in its bosom without certain destruction. Even Romanism itself again and again, by the mouth of Romish bishops and Romish sovereigns, and the wisest and best of Romish philosophers, Romish universities, and Popes themselves, has warned us of the fact."—*Quarterly Review*, No. 134, p. 586.

The number of their political banishments, amounting to *seventy* or upwards, is of itself a conclusive evidence of the restless and treasonable character of the Jesuits. As some addition to this evidence, a few memorials, derived from the published accounts of such expulsions, are subjoined.

In the decree, dated 29th December 1594, for the ban-

ishment of the Jesuits from France, the Jesuits were declared to be—

“Corrupters of youth, disturbers of the^e public repose, and enemies of the king and state.”

The decree issued by Queen Elizabeth, 18th November 1562, pronounces that the Jesuits,—

“The advisers of the new conspiracies formed against her person, had sought to instigate her subjects to insurrection—had carried on monopolies in order to aid such revolt—had stirred up foreign princes to associate for her destruction—had engaged in all the affairs of her kingdom—and had undertaken, by their discourses and writings, to dispose of her crown.”

In the expulsion of the Jesuits from Venice in 1606, the public sentence records that—

“The senate had discovered that the Jesuits had availed themselves of the office of confession to discover the secrets of families, and the talents and dispositions of individuals, and that by the same process *they knew the strength, resources, and secrets of the state*, an account of which they sent every six months to their general by their provincial or visitor.”

Supplementary to this testimony, the French ambassador at Venice, in writing home, reported that at Padua and Brecia, where they had not time to burn their papers—

“Memoirs were found relating to the monarchy of the world rather than the kingdom of heaven. . . . I read of no other religious order which has pursued this course. It is for princes and true patriots to open their eyes.”—Vol. iii. of *De Thou's Letters and Memoirs*.

The manifesto of the King of Portugal, addressed to the bishops of his kingdom in 1769, says :—

“It cannot be but the licentiousness introduced by the Jesuits, in which the three grand features are *falsehood, murder, and perjury*, should not give a new character to the morals of the ‘*Externi*,’ as the Jesuits call those who are not of their order ; as well as to the internal government of the ‘*Nostri*,’ or their own body. In fact, since these religious have introduced into Christian and civil society those perverted doctrines which render murder innocent—which sanctify falsehood—authorise perjury—deprive the laws of their power—destroy the submission of subjects—allow individuals the liberty of calumniating, killing, lying, and forswearing, as their

consciences may dictate—which remove the fear of human and divine legislation, and permit a man to redress his own grievances without applying to the magistrate,—it is easy to see, without much penetration, that Christian and civil society could not exist without a miracle."

In their expulsion from Russia, by a ukase of the Emperor Alexander, dated 13th March 1820, it is set forth :—

"They (the Jesuits) plant a stern intolerance in the minds of their votaries. . . . They destroy social happiness by dividing families. Their efforts are directed solely to their own interests and promotion; and their statutes furnish their consciences with a justification of every refractory and illegal action."

Suppression of the Jesuits by "Infallibility."

The doings of these firebrands ultimately threatened not only to destroy the peace of all kingdoms, but to subvert the institution of the Papacy itself. It was not till symptoms of such a design began to appear that the Papacy found it necessary, as a matter of self-defence, to suppress the order. This was first decided on by Clement XIII. ; but *his intention was scarcely broached when he died a suspicious death*. His successor, the virtuous Ganganelli (Clement XIV.), although fully alive to the danger of the measure, successfully followed up the frustrated intention of his predecessor, and issued the memorable bull, "Dominus ac Redemptor," by which the Jesuits were declared to be "henceforth and for ever suppressed."

A few brief extracts from the Bull of Suppression, dated 21st July 1773, will be instructive in relation to the estimate which infallibility has left on record touching the character of the Jesuits :—

"It appears from the Apostolic Constitutions, that almost at the very moment of institution, there arose in the bosom of this Society divers seeds of discord and dissension. . . . Hence the origin of that *infinity of appeals* and protests against this Society which so many sovereigns have laid at the feet of the throne of our predecessors, Paul IV., Pius V., and Sextus V. . . .

"Complaints and quarrels were multiplied on every side. In some places dangerous seditions arose, tumults, discords, dissensions, scandals, which, weakening or entirely breaking the bonds of

Christian charity, excited the faithful to all the rage of party hatreds and enmities. Desolation and danger grew to such a height, that the very sovereigns whose piety and liberality towards the company were so well known as to be looked upon as hereditary in their families—we mean our dearly-beloved sons in Christ, the kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Sicily—found themselves reduced to the necessity of expelling and driving from their states, kingdoms, and provinces, these very companions of Jesus; *persuaded that there remained no other remedy to so great evils; and that this step was necessary in order to prevent the Christians from rising one against another, and from massacring each other in the very bosom of our common mother, the Holy Church.*"

"Actuated by so many and important considerations, and, as we hope, aided by the presence and *inspiration of the Holy Ghost* having further considered that it was very difficult, not to say impossible, that the Church could recover a firm and durable peace so long as the said Society subsisted, *we do, of the fulness of our apostolical power, suppress and abolish the said company.*"—*Reports on Catholics in Foreign Countries*, printed by order of the House of Commons in 1817 and 1851, pp. 260–265.

When Ganganelli was preparing to issue his brief of suppression, before signing it he uttered the presentiment, "Sotho scriviamo la nostra morte"—"We sign our death." Accordingly, in a very short period after this decree, Ganganelli was hurried out of existence by a cause which the most varied and forcible circumstantial evidence has traced to assassination by poison. A mind of even ordinary rectitude is loth to put faith in the perpetration of this enormous crime; but the evidence, as furnished by St Priest and others, is so insuperable, that nothing but a morbid incredulity can resist laying this atrocious deed at the door of Jesuit turpitude. Ganganelli's Brief not only extinguished the Jesuits, but ratified their suppression for *all time*. His decisive words are:—

"This our letter shall not, under any form or pretext either of law or privilege, be sat in judgment upon or attacked, nor its power be weakened or withdrawn; but the present ordinance shall remain in full force *and operation from hence and for ever.*"

Notwithstanding the apparent inflexibility of this sentence, a succeeding Pope did "sit in judgment upon it," and did actually revoke its infallible and perpetual decree

by another equally infallible and equally perpetual constitution, enacting the

Restoration of the Jesuits!

It would not suit the summary references for which there is room in these pages to enter upon an explanation of the circumstances which led to the revival and restoration of this infamous sect to nearly their former privileges and position in the Church, after a suppression of forty-one years. It is sufficient to say that the motives which induced Pius VII. to grant a new existence to the order were simply political and necessitous on his part. Pius had been lately before a prisoner in the hands of the first Napoleon. After his return to Rome, advances were made to him from several quarters for the restoration of an order, whom, whatever may have been their former history, all acknowledged to possess in the highest degree those capabilities which were needed by the barque of Peter in passing through the perilous storms of the times, and which are so opportunely acknowledged in the

Bull, "Solicitude Omnium," for the Restoration of the Jesuits, 7th August 1814.

The Bull so called, judiciously passes over in silence the scandalous characteristics for which the order was suppressed. It almost commences with the falsehood that "the Catholic world had *unanimously* called for the restoration of the order," and, after expanding this falsehood a little, passes to express the real cause for which the order was restored, in these words:—

"We should deem ourselves guilty of a great crime towards God if, amidst these dangers of the Christian republic, we neglected the aids which the special providence of God has put at our disposal, and, *if placed in the barque of Peter, tossed and assailed by continual storms, we refused to employ the vigorous and experienced rowers who volunteer their services in order to break the waves of a sea which threaten every moment shipwreck and death.*"

Thus it is evinced that the restoration of the Jesuits was a necessity, arising out of the political commotions which affected the Church at the period; and the urgency

of this necessity may be inferred from the violence which this bull offered to the authority of the Bull of Suppression. We have thus, in all three infallible decisions affecting the fate of the Jesuits, with directly opposing results, the Bull of Institution, the Bull of Suppression, and the Bull of Restoration,—a very satisfactory proof that infallibility is quite consistent with the utmost degree of mutual contradictions among the rulers of the Papacy !

The temporary suspension of the Jesuits did not teach them to reform those vices for which they had been so ignominiously and deservedly suppressed. The society was not long reinstated in its ecclesiastical position and privileges, when the native animus of the body began to exhibit itself in a return to those political intrigues and treasonable practices which obliged members of the civil governments of Europe to *again resort to expulsion*—the number of state expulsions thus incurred by the order after their restoration being upwards of thirty !

As a sample of the latter-day doings of the order, we may refer to the civil war produced not long ago among the cantons of Switzerland, and in relation to which, British intercession being sought, a discussion on the subject in the House of Commons brought forth the following remarkable

Testimony of the late Lord Palmerston in reference to the Jesuits.

“The cause—the original cause of the conflict,” said the Premier —“were the Jesuits. It was their presence in Switzerland, *it was their aggressive proceedings in the Protestant cantons, which produced that war* with regard to which our mediation was asked for ; and it appeared to me that the only natural mode of putting an end to that war, was to remove the object and the cause of it. It was in that spirit that we proposed the Jesuits should be withdrawn. That I did, when making that proposal, state the reasons which induced me to make it, is undoubtedly true. I stated that it was my belief THAT THE PRESENCE OF THE JESUITS IN ANY COUNTRY, CATHOLIC OR PROTESTANT, WAS LIKELY TO DISTURB THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL PEACE OF THAT COUNTRY. I MAINTAIN THAT OPINION STILL, AND I DON'T SHRINK FROM ITS AVOWAL.”*

* *Times*, April 23, 1853.

At the moment these words are being penned, we learn by the public prints that the articles of the cession of Venetia to Italy, having included a provision for the expulsion of the Jesuits from this newly-acquired portion of Italian territory, the order sought for liberty to re-establish themselves in Vienna, and have been refused by the Emperor's government. This expatriation of the order from Popish countries naturally leads them to seek an asylum in British territory, a fact which demands a few remarks here on the

Present-day Jesuit Invasion of Britain.

Notwithstanding the warnings of all history, such candid and public testimony as that just quoted from the lips of the late prime minister, and the open violation of an Act of Parliament, which provides for "the gradual suppression and final suppression" of this order in Britain, it is notorious that the Jesuits are now arriving in troops on our shores, and are propagating their principles, and planting their institutions in this land with a rapidity and success never before exhibited in the history of the order. The spreading apostacy of the Church of England may be entirely attributed to the disguised agencies of Jesuit propagandists. But it is not merely in the church, but in the political and social institutions of the kingdom, that the Jesuit is, without any reasonable doubt, plying his trade with that success which has ever attended the unobstructed efforts of this Society—a Society which not only pursues its avocations with sleepless activity and zeal, but with all the advantages of that impenetrable *incognita* which it is the privilege of its members to assume. The Jesuit is thus as invisible and ubiquitous as the master whom he serves; and acting his part in masquerade, he is not merely an emissary of Satan, "speaking lies in hypocrisy," but a living incarnation of falsehood. Thus disguised, the Jesuit penetrates and permeates every form of society. He is found in the court and councils of every nation, and in the pulpit of every religion—among the members of every profession and art and trade. He appears, without exciting the most remote suspicion of his presence, in the university,

the academy, the factory, and the workshop, as well as in the most confidential positions in the domestic enclosure, where the male or female Jesuit succeeds in accomplishing such results as the following in Edinburgh :—

“An excellent man gets two female servants into his house as *Protestants*. By and by he finds his little boys horrified at the name of John Knox, and at all references to the Reformation. He discovers, to his astonishment, that his servants are two Popish emissaries in disguise busy corrupting his children.”

“A girl, a member of one of our leading Free Churches, is a servant where Papists are. By accident, as it were, a plausible Popish book is left in her room. The girl reads; her curiosity is excited; she reads more, and is a little staggered; she is handed over to the priest, who earnestly exhorts her not to speak to any Protestant minister, and the scene ends by her becoming a firm adherent to the Man of Sin.”

“A priest enters one of the public schools, and by every art of flattery tries to convert the teacher.”

“A medical man, when passing a Popish chapel on a week-day, looks in from mere curiosity. A few days after a most polite man calls at his house, refers to the circumstance, and blandly and broadly intimates that if he will join the Popish Church his business will be greatly promoted.”

“A zealous young lady teaches a few young women to read. But lo! a pupil presents herself for admission, who is discovered to be an excellent reader already, and is found to be a spy sent to watch the school.”

“There is a highly respectable family, in which there are several daughters. The eldest is a most accomplished person, and very fond of music. At a music party, she is introduced to a young priest, and the family are surprised to find her suddenly about to become a Papist.”—*Dr Begg's Handbook of Popery*, pp. 305, 306.

Dr Begg supplies various other similar cases occurring in other parts of Scotland, of which the following are samples, in which several names are necessarily omitted :

“Lady Harris, a very beautiful young widow, only twenty-six years old, perverted last year to Popery, has given over to the *Jesuits* her beautiful estate of Seacliff, in East Lothian, her prospects of £10,000 a year from an old uncle, (Mr Sligo, Carmylie,) and all the treasures collected in India by her late husband.”

“Mr —, only seventeen, has left his family, and given himself over, as well as his whole patrimony, to the Jesuits in Edinburgh.”

“Mr —, a near relation of the Earl of —, discovered lately

that his own wife had been secretly perverted, and had carried over her young son and two beautiful daughters. He never recovered the shock."

"A nephew of —— has given up £80,000 on the day he came of age. And —— and —— have likewise gone over."—*Ibid.*, pp. 307, 308.

These cases are but a sample of a fast-spreading and successful system of proselytism occurring in the very heart of Scotland, and they are transferred to these pages simply to awaken the people of Scotland, and more especially of Edinburgh, to this alarming progress which Popery is making in a land where it was once thought the strumpet of Rome would never again dare to unveil her adulterous face.

If it is a fact that in Edinburgh the whole missionary operations of the Church of Rome are handed over to a Jesuit agency, does not such a fact imperatively call upon the inhabitants of this city to put themselves in an attitude of resistance to an aggression already attended with such alarming results as to indicate a possible success to the grand project of the Papacy—the recovery of Britain to the religion of Rome and the dominion of the Pope.

Our warnings in relation to this aim are not merely to be derived from our home experience, but from numerous foreign sources. A single quotation will be sufficient to show the progress and prospects of Jesuitism in Britain, being the testimony of one whose past position and experience in the Church of Rome, and present standing as a most able and esteemed Protestant minister, entitles his opinion to the highest regard:—

"In countries which do not recognise the order (of Jesuits), the General perhaps possesses even greater influence. The Jesuits in these circumstances occupy the position of missionaries, or are *disguised under some other name*. To such a land the General despatches his most astute agents to carry on his designs by every pretext; and though they dare not declare themselves Jesuits, they procure persons to associate voluntarily in these designs who know nothing of the company. My confessor, of whom you have frequently heard, one day when he was in a more cordial vein than usual, disclosed to me

"Incredible Facts concerning Jesuitism in England.

"For example, that, despite all the persecution they have met with, they have not abandoned a country where there are a greater

number of Jesuits than in Italy; that there are Jesuits in all classes of society—in Parliament, among the clergy, among the Protestant laity even in the higher stations. I could not comprehend how a Jesuit could be a Protestant priest, or how a Protestant priest could be a Jesuit; but my confessor silenced my scruples by telling me, *Omnia munda mundis*—[To the pure all things are pure]—and that St Paul became a Jew that he might save the Jews. It was no wonder, therefore, if a Jesuit should feign to be a Protestant for the conversion of Protestants. But pay attention to my discoveries concerning the nature of the religious movement in England termed Puseyism.”—*Popery and Jesuitism at Rome*, by Dr De Santis.

Space does not permit a lengthier extract from the able and interesting work of Doctor De Sanctis on *Popery and Jesuitism at Rome*. We see by the passage quoted, that the “General” of Jesuits—the “Head-Centre” of the Ecclesiastical Fenianism which conspires against the constitution and liberties of this land—is keenly alive to the present-day grand desideratum of the Papacy—the religious and consequent political conquest of Britain. Do not the facts already indicated with respect to the progress of Popery in Jesuitism, even in the metropolis of the land of Knox—a land in which, some few years back, it would have been thought impossible that Rome would ever succeed in making a single proselyte—indicate a possible success to the designs of the Papacy in relation to this kingdom? and do not such facts call upon the inhabitants of this land to exercise a zealous resistance against the formidable aggression which threatens the civil and religious liberty of this country?

Social and Political Relations of Monasticism.

The past and progressive extirpation of Continental Monastery—the facilities, or rather the patronage, given to the swarms of these expatriated drones who seek a refuge in Britain, as well as the Monastic tendencies so fast progressing in the Church of England—promises to convert Britain into a gigantic Monastery for the rest of the world!

The past history of Monastery, and the political and social evils which have caused, and are still causing, the extinction of the system in all Popish states, do not seem

to affect us in reference to the fruits of Monastic "counsels." Each of these three Monastic counsels, called "Counsels of Perfection," and their corresponding vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience, are fraught with a separate class of evils, both social and political, in every state. The vows, of course, are glaringly violated pledges; but the system possesses the peculiarity of involving as much evil when the vows are kept as when they are broken. Taking the more favourable view of the case, or regarding the Monk as faithful to his vows, then the social and political evils resulting from the observance of these vows by so large a number of the subjects of any state must be, and has ever proved, in the highest degree prejudicial to the interests of general society and civil government.

First, The vow of *poverty* or pauperism. Taking human nature as it is, he who morbidly discards property will always discard *work*, and he who discards work must be maintained by *the work of others*. In point of fact, this has been precisely the result of Monkery wherever it succeeds in gaining a footing; so that while Monastic institutions fail to *produce*, they do not fail to *consume*, a large portion of the national wealth. Such would be the simple result when the vow of poverty is faithfully kept: but we know full well that this vow is a make-believe employed to acquire wealth, and riot in luxury and laziness. Hence the vow of *poverty* is virtually a vow of *property*, and the effect of the vow is to make the Monk rich, and the rest of the nation poor. This would be the natural result if the Monastic corporations were even to acquire their support by an *honest appeal* to voluntary benevolence; but the Monks not only thus abstract wealth from the industrious of the nation, but resort to the perpetration of the most enormous transactions in pious fraud. This species of Monastic imposture is chiefly effected by the exposure of new relics, fabricating new legends, and relating new miracles, for the purpose of abstracting gifts from the ailing, the penitent, and the pilgrim, whom superstition draws to the Monastic gate. These gifts have been cunningly designated by the term "offerings," and

are always sought in the name of some saint, whose intercession is declared to be procured for the giver. Hume relates that the offerings at the shrine of St Thomas-à-Becket amounted in one year to £954, 6s. 4d., a sum, taking the greater value of money in those days, equivalent to about £10,000. It is further recorded that the gold taken from the shrine of the saint at Canterbury filled two chests, which eight strong men could hardly carry.

Since the Reformation, the traffic in relics, &c., has so much fallen off, that the Monastic traders have been obliged to resort to other modes of raising funds. The new modes, it must be confessed, are much more creditable to the community than the traffic in relics and other spiritual merchandise; but, nevertheless, the Monks are giving great dissatisfaction by the change, as will be easily seen by a reference to the present state of the matter in France :—

“There seems some likelihood that there will soon be an outcry against certain religious orders in this country for mercantile reasons. I write ‘mercantile reasons,’ though the word, in connection with religious orders, will seem strange. The fact is, that many of these orders are *purely* and *simply* trading concerns. For a long time the Monks of La Chartreuse have, as everybody knows—that is, everybody who lives in a region where the higher class of creature comforts are to be found—invented a delicious *liqueur* called after their monastery, and it is sold at so much a bottle. On the proceeds of the sale the Monks live and prosper. Their trading success has caused numerous other orders to embark in the liqueur-making business. We see placards on all the walls announcing Benedictine, Trappist, Dominican, Carmelite, and other liqueurs; and we are constantly receiving prospectuses from the agents of monasteries.”

The writer then goes on to enumerate several other manufacturing and trading enterprises which the Monks, male and female, are busy carrying on, and then adds :—

“All this trading of course constitutes a serious competition to regular distillers; ointment, wash, and shirt makers; tailors, schoolmasters, and mistresses. And the competition is obnoxious from the fact that, while all these people (the regular traders) have licenses to pay for carrying on their trades, and high rents to pay for shops and offices, and heavy outlays to make for wages, lighting,

and taxes, the monasteries and convents pay no licenses, no rent, no taxes, no wages, and next to nothing for lighting."

The writer might have added, that Monks and Nuns, being also unencumbered with a family expenditure, cannot fail to vastly undersell the ordinary trader in the same commodity. See, for the above extract, *The Press* and *St James's Chronicle*, October 27, 1866.

The vow of *celibacy*, like the vow of poverty, is fraught with numerous social and political ills, and this whether the vow is observed or violated. If the Monk is faithful to its engagements, he severs himself from all those ties which are necessary to the wellbeing of the community and the prosperity of the commonwealth. He who has no family interests will cease to have those which are social, and he who is devoid of social interests must be politically disaffected towards every public measure, and every national enterprise, except so far as these bear upon the concerns of the isolated community of which he forms a member.

Rome appeals to Scripture to support her institutional celibacy; but however the passages referred to may be brought to countenance the practice of celibacy on the part of *individuals* of a rare congenial temperament, no Scripture can be wrested to the support of that gregarious celibacy which is proper to Romanism, and which so much intensifies the moral, social, and political evils of enforced single life. It is not, therefore, merely the principle or practice of celibacy in individual life which tends to any perceptible social or political evils; it is the *corporate* and *combinative* character of Monastic bachelorhood which has so corrupted the institution itself, made the interests of his order occupy those of wife, children, kindred, and country, and given to Monkery its formidable powers in the creation of social and political mischief.

Next, the vow of *obedience* immeasurably increases those evils, by stamping out the principle of civil loyalty, and subjecting Monks to the legislative will of a subject

instead of the sovereign. Hear what Loyola himself says in relation to the obedience of his order :—

“That man’s obedience is not worthy to be called by the name of virtue who does not make *the will of the Superior his own*.

“But if you would *immolate* yourself wholly unto God you must offer to Him not the bare will merely, but the *understanding* also ; to think just what the Superior thinks, and to *take his judgment for your own*.

“The noble simplicity of *blind obedience* is gone if in our secret breast we call in question whether that which is commanded be *right or wrong*.

“He who lives under obedience ought, under the providence of God, sincerely to be governed, and behave exactly as if he were a *corpse*, which suffers itself to be turned in all directions, and dragged everywhere ; or as if he were *an old man’s staff*, to be used wheresoever and in whatsoever he who holds it in his hand wishes.”

It is easy to see that such subjection to a Monkish master excludes all respect for civil authority ; and hence the “vow of obedience” has always included the obligation to act the rebel against all civil law and all civil power that the Superior judged to conflict with the rules and authority which the Monk was pledged to obey by this “vow of perfection.”

This “vow of perfection” is not only a vow of perfidy in relation to the civil rulers, but a vow of rebellion against some of the clearest injunctions of the Divine ruler Himself. The “vow of obedience” releases children from all obligations to parents, and parents from all obligations to their offspring. Wives who choose to enter a nunnery are freed from the vow of obedience to their husbands by the vow of obedience taken to the religious Superior ; and a husband has only to take a Monastic vow in order to be free to violate the vow by which he pledged himself to a life-long companionship with a confiding partner. Monastic obedience, therefore, is simply Monastic rebellion—not only against the laws of man, but against the most sacred obligations which can bind humanity to its Creator.

But no department of the Monastic system so directly ignores the authority of the human law and civil authority as the *mural imprisonment* which proves so essential a con-

comitant of conventual polity, and so effectually aids the Monastic ruler in escaping the obligations, and violating the precepts of civil government. The evidence of such a provision for the concealment of iniquity, and for affording facilities to plan and execute treasonable and seditious intrigues against civil authority, is worthy of satanic wisdom. By means of this walled-in privacy, Popery has been enabled to mature its ablest schemes, and defeat the ablest efforts to detect them.

It is a peculiarity of Britain, and, we believe, of the United States, that the conventual prisons called nunneries are the only ones in those countries exempt from the inspection and control of the civil power. In Popish states the character and influence of conventual establishments are too well known to be thus excepted from the surveillance of civil authority. With the usual dexterity of the late Cardinal Wiseman he defends the jail walls and grated windows of the conventual domicile, on the principle that such a protective architecture is necessary for the security of the inmates against popular intrusion ! However this may be, it is certain that the secretive walls of these establishments is an effectual security against the discovery of crime. In all other domestic establishments such a thing as a sudden death cannot occur without the establishment and its inhabitants being subject to the scrutiny of the civil power ; but within our Monastic and conventual walls deeds of darkness, including death under the most suspicious circumstances, may at any time occur without the least likelihood of the perpetrators being disturbed in their haunts by the vigilance of the policeman, or the duties of the coroner.

But taking the most favourable view of the morality within these haunts of superstition, founded on the principle of substituting ceremony for religion, the whole system is, in the highest degree, anti-social as well as anti-constitutional in this kingdom. By the appointment of nature, children and their parents are destined to be reciprocal supports—each in their season ; the parents of children, while the children are yet unable to provide for themselves,

and the children of parents, when the latter become the helpless victims of age and disease. There is no more obvious provision of natural providence than this, and no more obvious and effectual mode of subverting this divine and benevolent arrangement than by shutting up and separating for life both parents and children within those Papal dungeons which are now being erected everywhere in this accredited land of liberty and light.

Imperative Call for the Legal Suppression of Monastic Institutions in Britain.

If the civil power of this country sees no occasion for such a measure of suppression, Continental Popish states have nearly all shown themselves to be of an opposite opinion. From the period of the Reformation down to the present day, the extinction of Monastic establishments in Popish countries has gradually progressed; and in a very short time Britain is likely to be left alone in the enjoyment of these corporations. Doubtless the fact that every Protestant country is so chary of intolerance is the main cause which permits and prolongs the existence of these treasonable anti-social and anti-constitutional corporations in British territory.

It is fortunate, in relation to this cry of intolerance, that the process of Monastic dissolution was commenced by the authority of the Pope himself—Clement VII. having dissolved twenty-one English monasteries in 1524, and ten more in 1528. The *reason* for this suppression, which was conducted by Cardinal Wolsey, is worthy of notice, as being supplied by the Cardinal himself, whose proceedings on the occasion are thus described :—

“ Having been invested with the Legatim office by Bull from the Pope, he had formed the project of visiting the Monasteries, and by his personal authority of suppressing *the most scandalous*, and converting their foundations into cathedrals, collegiate churches, or colleges; but his own conduct not being the most exemplary, he was advised to use the name of his Holiness in thus appropriating the temporalities of religious houses, . . . an encroachment upon possessions hitherto held sacred, which prepared the people for similar proceedings by the civil power, especially as the Bull,

which allowed this spoliation, assigned as a reason the profligacy and ignorance of the clergy, who were declared to be delivered over to a reprobate mind."—*History of Religions in England*, by Aikman p. 53.

Doubtless this act had no small share in suggesting the like process to Henry VIII., when he came to break squares with the Pope, and

"The trumpery that ascends in bare display,
Bulls, pardons, relics—cows, black, white, and grey,
Upwhirled."

It does not belong to the design of these remarks to chronicle the various movements by which Monastic institutions have been, and are still being, dissolved in Popish states. Every day brings fresh accounts that the process is rapidly progressing, more especially on the Italian peninsula, where such establishments and their effects being best understood are undergoing the most effective and complete dismantling. If this extirpation of the most corrupting, the most socially pernicious and politically obstructive institution of the Papacy is the best indication of the future prosperity of Italy, the progress of Monastery in Britain as plainly testifies of the infatuated tendencies of the nation to return to that medieval moonlight, and that civil and religious barbarism, which constituted the dark millennium of the Papacy.

Testimonies to the Social and Political Evils of Monasticism.

The Monastic system has its apologetic defenders even among Protestant professors. Monasticism, they say, had a useful mission in the department of human civilisation. According to these apologists, man, before he comes to be adequately subject to the influence of reason, must be governed by the aid of superstition; that is, by *delusion*. It is alleged, in effect, that the middle ages embraced so much social barbarism that the spiritual tenets of a pure Christianity could neither be understood or appreciated, and that the restraints of political subjection could only be

made effectual by those imaginary hopes and fears which Popery, but especially Monkery, so effectually substituted for Christian motives.

Doubtless the times referred to were barbarous ; but who and what made the barbarism ? Either the barbarism made Popery, or Popery made the barbarism. If the former, then the Christian Church has failed to fulfil her mission ; instead of the light dispelling the darkness, the darkness all but extinguished the light. If the latter, then the Church is responsible for the barbarism, in which some would find an extenuation for her shortcoming, or rather for her positive guilt.

Another ground for the praise of Monkery has been found in the alleged service the system has rendered to the world by the preservation of its literary treasures during the ages just referred to ; the truth being, that while the monasteries were the depositories of much of these treasures, the Monks were literary bankers, who never increased their capital by any successful attempts in the way of investigation or discovery. The Monks added nothing to our literary stores, with the exception of chronicling some current events, a service thus commented on by Hume :—

“The Monks, who were the only annalists during these ages, lived remote from public affairs, considered the *civil transactions as entirely subordinate* to the ecclesiastical ; and besides partaking of the ignorance and barbarity which were then universal, were strongly infected with credulity, with the love of wonder, and with a propensity to imposture—*vices almost inseparable from their mode of life.*”

But Monkery did more than merely fail to increase the stock of literary wealth of which it became the monopolists. Much of that precious wealth was *corrupted* or *extinguished* by those unconscious of its value, and by such a style of literary demolition as the following :—

“When we call to mind what works of the ancients have been *obliterated* by the monkish transcribers, and what the writings are which were transferred to vellum in their stead, something must be set off against the debt which literature owes to the Monastic institutions.”—Southey’s *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, p. 327.

“Before the revival of letters, the *Monks* used to sell the parchments on which Greek and Latin authors were written, to booksellers and rocket-makers. Some eminent works were rescued by scholars in this way, and others were found rotting in lumber-rooms of monasteries and abbeys.

“To save the expense of parchment, the *Monks* and caligraphists were in the practice of *obliterating previous writing* by a chemical preparation, or of *erasing it from silk or flaxen paper*; and in this way thousands of valuable MSS. *have been lost*. Greek dramas, works of Cicero, &c., &c., have been traced under the new writing; and Abbe Mai of Milan has collected some valuable fragments of antiquity from Babbio. Under a trumpery poem he traced three orations of Cicero. Under some Acts of a Romish Council he traced three others, with an ancient commentary; also eight speeches of Symmachus and the works of Fronto, tutor to Aurelius. Under another he found fragments of Plautus, and commentaries on Terence; also an oration of Isæus. Finally, he has restored a work of Dionysius Halicarnassus, and found 800 lines of a very ancient Iliad.”—Sir Richard Phillip’s *Million of Facts*, pp. 589, 590.

Thus, to procure a ready prepared article for their own productions, the Monks, totally unable to appreciate the golden thoughts of past generations, made no scruple to erase these memorials, to record in their stead the “old wives’ fables,” or the “lives and miracles of the saints,” that form the chief of the literary treasures with which Monkenry has enriched the world!

William Cobbett has been already quoted. Another citation from his graphic pen is supplied for the benefit of Roman Catholics. Any quotation from the writer is of interesting importance in the Romish controversy, from the fact that Cobbett is the “Protestant Historian of the Reformation;” and his work is so homologated by Roman Catholics, that at this very moment, James Duffy, the Roman Catholic publisher of Dublin, is issuing a new edition of Cobbett’s work at a price (6d.) evidently reduced to a minimum to insure a broadcast circulation of this famous work. It may appear hard to account for the opposite strains in which Cobbett writes of Popery, but if Roman Catholics receive his testimony in the one case, they must abide by it in the other. In the present case, he is engaged in a strain of censure against what he con-

sidered the political evils of his day, and wishing to begin at the beginning, he says :—

“When I have traced corruption back to her very egg, I shall proceed to develop to you the means of crushing or of adding that egg, in order that our children, at least, may be delivered from those numerous broods which now, vulture-like, prey upon our very vitals. The place where a set of Monks lived, or where they still live, is called a *convent* in England. This word comes from the French word *couvent*, and this comes from the French word *couver*, which means to sit over eggs. The brood which comes from a sitting is, in French, called a *couvee*; and hence comes our word, a *covey* of partridges. The Monks’ place was (thus) called *couvent* in French, and *convent* in English, because they pretended that they were a brood of the *choice children of God*, collected together in fulfilment of that passage of Scripture which says, ‘Like as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, so will the Lord gather his chickens under his wings.’ Pretty chickens they have been! From them have gone forth a great part of the curses which have afflicted the world. *It was in the convents or sitting-places that were hatched the Inquisition and all the means of robbing, tormenting, and brutalising mankind, which have produced such dreadful misery.* The French Revolution disturbed a great many of these hatching-places. They put the chickens—that is to say, the gormandising, drunken, debauched, and savage Monks—to flight, sold the lands and houses which they had extorted, and exposed the whole thing to the hatred which they so well merited. And our sweat and blood have been expended in order to restore, as far as possible, this scandalous cheat—(that is, *Monkery*)—this gross insult and injustice towards the people of France, Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands. Our universities, colleges, and great schools are of Monkish origin, and still retain, along with the dormitories and cloisters of the Monks, many of their rules and regulations, much of their profligacy, and all their greediness and cunning. In place of meriting the appellation grounded upon the tender idea of a brood of innocent little creatures, collected under the wings of the fondest of mothers, the convents of the Monks were wasps’ nests, whence the lazy, cruel inhabitants sallied forth to rob and sting—to annoy, persecute, and murder the industrious, laborious, and provident bees.”—Cobbett’s *Register* of November 1817.

Cobbett here complains, not of British policy being applied to the support of Monkery at home, but *abroad*. How much more his indignation would have been roused, if he had witnessed what the British Government are

doing in our day, not to support Monasticism abroad, (for this would be hopeless at present,) but in his native land !

The Sacrament of Matrimony.

So the Church of Rome designates the conventional contract which unites man and wife for life. As the Church founds all her usurped authority in relation to this contract on the assumption that the legitimate union of man and woman in wedlock involves a sacramental institution, she has left no stone unturned to force and foist the notion upon the world, and to falsify even the Bible itself to bring the control of this union within the clutches of priestcraft.

In Ephesians v. 31, 32, Paul, speaking of the marriage union of the believing husband and wife, takes occasion to allude to it as a symbol of the union of Christ and the Church, and says of the *latter* union, "This is a great mystery." The Church of Rome, unable to extract a marriage sacrament out of any other passage of the Scriptures, has made no scruple to falsify and wrest this one to answer her purpose ; that is, to accommodate the passage to her wants, she first substitutes for the expression, "this is a great mystery," her own palpable corruption, "this is a great sacrament," and then she applies the phrase to the marriage union of man and wife, instead of to the mystical union of Christ and the Church ! The Greek word, *μυστήριον*, occurs about twenty-seven times in the New Testament, and in twenty-one times out of the twenty-seven the Popish Bibles render the word, as the Protestant Bible renders it, by the word "mystery." Hence, by rendering the same word, "sacrament," in Eph. v. 32, the Douay translators have not only departed from the original and the Protestant translation, but, in order to serve their purpose, have actually departed from the rendering given by themselves in every other instance. It is a constant charge made by the Church of Rome, that Protestants falsify the Scriptures ; that is, the Popish Church first falsifies the text, and then charges the Protestant Church with the commission of the crime !

That the marriage union can be no way identified with a sacramental ordinance, is evident from the nature of a sacrament, as taught and exemplified in the case of all the other sacraments proper to Popery itself. A sacrament, according to this teaching, is a *positive* institution, having no connection, symbolic or otherwise, with *natural duties*—such as those which pertain to the matrimonial union. The marriage union is based upon a dictate of nature, and involves obligations and duties proper to *moral* instead of *positive* law. Hence, neither in the Old Testament nor in the New are the officials of religion called on to recognise marriage in other than a moral relationship. We never read either of a priest in the Old Testament, or an apostle in the New, making it a part of their ministry to “dispense the sacrament” of marriage; and it would have been much to the advantage of Protestantism, if its ministers, instead of assuming the office of marriage-agents, and surrounding the marriage act with a religious ceremony, had left these unscriptural remnants of Popery in the exclusive service of the Church that devised them.

Another general reason why matrimony can be no sacrament, results from the principle that a scriptural sacrament is a contract exclusively between God and man, and not a contract between man and man, or, in the case of wedlock, between man and woman.

Further, the obligations of a scriptural sacrament can never be dissolved or divorced; but matrimony admits of dissolution in case of the death of either party, and of divorce in case of adultery, as ruled by Christ himself, (Matt. v. 32.)

Again, according to Popery itself, a sacrament is an *outward sign* of an invisible grace. But Popish matrimony is notoriously devoid of any sacramental symbol. The trinket called a marriage-ring is certainly a visible article, and perhaps it is intended to be a visible sign; but then it is only a copy from a Pagan rite instead of being a scriptural appointment.

That the Popish sacrament of matrimony, and its ceremonial adjuncts, are pure developments from heathenism, is evident from the fact that, unlike many other parts of Popery, it has no plausible foundation in the Jewish dispensation.

The Jewish law, regarding the marriage contract as one growing out of a natural relationship between the sexes, left this contract to be secured simply by moral and civil sanctions. It therefore alike excluded the services of a priestly official and a religious ceremonial. Even when the Jews, by their own unauthorised choice, did come to celebrate marriage with festive and ceremonial rites, a priest was never required as an official necessary to the validity of the contract.

On the contrary, among the heathen nations, and particularly among the Romans, marriage was celebrated as a religious contract, and by religious rites, from which Popery has borrowed the elements of her matrimonial ritual.

Although we have not precise historical data for tracing the origin and growth of this sacrament in the system of Popery, yet the genius of the system is sufficiently suggestive of the process. The priesthood, ever on the watch to embrace such openings and seize upon such positions as tended to advance their secular advantage, must have early perceived that the marriage institution offered a favourable occasion to promote their professional importance and social influence. Having succeeded in producing the impression that his official services were at least consistent with the spirit and design of the marriage compact, the priest soon assumed the position of an agent *necessary* to the civil and religious validity of the marriage union. As a religious official, he would be impelled to associate with his official duties a religious service or ceremony. Tradition speedily transformed this priestly performance into a New Testament ordinance. Subsequently, the ordinance, even as early as the days of St Augustine, in the fifth century, came to be regarded by many in the light of a sacrament. This idea grew with the growth of the

Popish system at large, and, like other developments, it became a practical acknowledgment of the general Church ere it received a dogmatic position. It was not till the twelfth century, when Peter Lombard, a French bishop, had perfected the sevenfold sacramental system of the Papacy, that matrimony, along with the four other bastard sacraments of Popery, came to be fully recognised as one of the seven now held by the Church of Rome.

Political Relations of the so-called Sacrament of Matrimony.

There is hardly any exercise of his alleged authority to "bind and loose" in which the priest is more jealous of his power than the prerogative to bind as well as to loose the marriage knot. The following is some of the legislation of the Papacy on the subject, that is, of the Council of Trent "On the sacrament of Matrimony:"—

"Canon I. If any one saith that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelic law instituted by Christ the Lord, and that it does not confer grace, let him be anathema."

It is here declared, of course, that this sacrament, like others, confers grace. But, as in the case of the others, Roman Catholics must never be allowed to forget that this grace, according to the teaching of the Church, depends on the "Sacramental Intention" of the priest. The Council of Trent has itself testified to the possibility of this intention being at any time withheld, unknown to the sacramental recipient.—See Waterworth's edition of the Council, Index to the work, under the head "Sacraments," and the sub-head, "*Intention required on the part of the Priest.*"

Hence, if that intention should happen to be withheld, the Popish husband and wife, instead of being lawfully married, are doomed to live in adultery, and, as a consequence, to become the parents of an illegitimate offspring.

"Canon III. If any saith that those degrees only of consanguinity and affinity which are set down in Leviticus can hinder matrimony from being contracted, and *that the Church cannot dispense*

in some of those degrees, or establish others that may hinder or dissolve marriage, let him be anathema."

The degrees referred to are those accepted by the legislation of all civilised states. But the above canon overrides the laws both of God and man ; it professes to allow marriage between degrees of consanguinity which God has clearly prohibited, and to prohibit between degrees which God has never restricted. A more heaven-daring and explicit opposition to the Divine authority is scarcely to be found even in the code of the Papacy.

"Canon IV. If any one saith that the Church cannot establish impediments dissolving marriage, or that she has erred in establishing them, let him be anathema."

In the chapter preceding the series of canons quoted, the Council of Trent says :—

"The first parent of the human race, under the influence of the Divine Spirit, pronounced the bond of matrimony perpetual and indissoluble when he said, 'This now is bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh,' &c.

"But that by this bond two only are united and joined together our Lord taught more plainly when, rehearsing these last words, (as an utterance of the mind of God,) he said, 'therefore now they are not two, but one flesh.'

"What, *therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*"

When the Church of Rome, by the regulation of Canon IV. last quoted, assumes the authority to divorce or dissolve marriage, and grants a dispensation or divorce—such, for example, as the Pope granted to Napoleon I., when the Emperor divorced the Empress Josephine, and contracted a new marriage with the Emperor of Austria's daughter—when, we say, the Church so acts, she feels that she commits no violation of the Saviour's command quoted by herself,—"*What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*" The reason is, that, when the Pope grants a dispensation to divorce or dissolve marriage, the Church teaches, that it is not *man* but *God* that puts asunder what He himself had previously authorised to be "joined together." The reason, of course,

is perfectly valid if *the Pope is God*, as the Canon law has called him in the well-known gloss, “our Lord God the Pope!”

The Church, therefore, not only dissolves marriage in such cases as the Scriptures themselves allow of divorce, but she can “establish or create impediments (causes) dissolving marriage” by her own authority. That this authority, and all other assumptions of power in relation to marriage, are claimed with the view of wresting from the civil department the right to legislate on the subject of matrimony, is made evident by the last canon with which the Council of Trent guards the authority of the priests in the province of marriage:—

“Canon XII. If any one saith that matrimonial causes do not belong to *ecclesiastical judges*, let him be anathema.”

The latest piece of canonical legislation on the subject of matrimony is found in Pope Pius IX.’s now famous “Syllabus,” (8th Dec. 1864,) in which the following propositions occur:—

“Prop. 66. The sacrament of marriage is not merely an adjunct of the civil contract, *from which it is separable*.

“Prop. 67. Divorce cannot be pronounced by the *civil power*.

“Prop. 73. The contract is not valid, *if the sacrament does not exist*.

“Prop. 74. Matrimonial causes *belong by their nature to the ecclesiastical power*.”

This legislation evidently decides, that all within the Church of Rome who contract marriage by a civil agency, exclusive of the ecclesiastical rule, are living in adultery; and that their offspring are illegitimate in the eyes of the Church. The Italian civil law, as well as the French, now happily pronounces against infallibility in this case by properly defining, that marriage is a civil contract which comes under the cognizance of the civil power; and the union thus constituted, as well as the offspring of the parents, are not the less legitimate because the pronouncements of the Pope’s Syllabus have been thus discarded and condemned by the wiser decision of civil Popery. So

much for the "*unity*" which is said to constitute the "first mark" of the true Church.

Some have doubted whether these pronouncements of the Pope's canon law, affecting marriages *within* the Church, are also applicable to heretics or Protestants. As this doubt could only arise in the minds of those who have not been duly informed in the doctrines of Popery, it affords an argument why Protestants, and especially legislators, should acquaint themselves with the principles of Popery as a necessary branch of *political science*. Let persons labouring under the doubt referred to, then, be taught that *heretical baptism* is declared and acknowledged valid by the Papacy purposely to constitute a theological basis for subjecting the heretic to all the *other constitutions or laws* of the Church, and consequently to all her laws concerning the matrimonial contract.

These remarks on the civil relations of the Popish sacrament may be supplemented by a reference to some of the more obvious reasons why the contract of matrimony should be exclusively regulated by the civil power. Legislation against crime can only be either sound or sufficient when based upon the Divine code of morality. If it be the duty of the legislature to punish the violations of its so formed criminal code, it is equally the duty of governments to make such provisions as shall aid the subject in keeping the law. It is not, for instance, enough for the civil power to enact laws against theft—a violation of the eighth commandment; it is equally its duty, by educational and other means, to promote the sentiment and practice of honesty. It is not enough to provide for the punishment of perjury; good legislation and government will also make provision for the promotion of truth.

In the same way the civil legislature which provides for the punishment of adultery—a violation of the seventh commandment—will also make consistent provision for the promotion of matrimonial fidelity. In other words, the government will not only legislate against the crime of adultery, but so define and guard the contract of marriage as to further and secure the fulfilment of its obligations.

Hence to the civil power, guided by New Testament precepts, rightly belongs all human legislation touching the terms and obligations of the marriage relationship.

Ritualism.

The Third Article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. concludes with binding the Romanist to accept all the ceremonial or rites which the Church associates with the ministry of her sacraments. The ceremonial of the sacraments are the media through which the priest administers the spiritual opiates of this system of ordinances.

The Jewish dispensation was eminently ritualistic. But although the ritual was an aggregate and divinely-appointed symbol of New Testament realities, Paul, comparing it with these realities, designates it a system of "beggarly elements." Such rites were wisely adapted to the infantile state of the Church; but when the substance of these shadows appeared, the shadows themselves were put away as the forsaken toys of religious childhood. "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things," (1 Cor. xiii. 11.)

The ritual of the Papacy, although largely derived from paganism, as Dr Newman admits, ("Essay on Development,") is an attempt to rival the Jewish in symbolic representations of New Testament principles. There is, however, this material difference in the cases: the Jewish ritual was a prospective type—a type of *future* realities—while the ceremonial system of the Papacy is a dumb symbol of objects and events which have already fulfilled, and therefore abolished the type.

The Development of the Ritual Element in the Church was one of the earliest manifestations of Popery, and afforded one of the surest evidences of that apostate animus which yearned with desire to return to the "beggarly elements" of form, symbol, and shadow, and to put these elements in the place of the spirit, substance, and realities which they were fabricated to represent.

“ Now ceremony leads her bigots forth,
Prepared to fight for shadows of no worth ;
While truths, on which eternal things depend,
Find not, or hardly find, a single friend.
As soldiers watch the signals of command,
They learn to bow, to kneel, to sit, to stand ;
Happy to fill religion's sacred place
With hollow form, and gesture, and grimace.”

The pages of ecclesiastical history furnish the evidences and data which trace the rapid growth of these mumeries.

“ While the fostering care of the emperors (says Mosheim, speaking of the Church in the fourth century) sought to advance the Christian religion, the indiscreet piety of the bishops obstructed its true nature, and oppressed its energies by the multiplication of *rites and ceremonies*. They introduced, with but slight alteration, into the Christian worship those rites and institutions by which formerly the Greeks and Romans and other nations had manifested their reverence towards their imaginary deities—supposing the people would more readily embrace Christianity if they perceived the rites handed down to them from their fathers still existing unchanged among Christians, and perceived that Christ and the martyrs were worshipped in the same manner as formerly their gods were.”—*Fourth Century*, part ii. chap. 4.

It is not difficult to account for this change in the ministrations of the Church, if we reflect that in the absence of that Christian culture, or that instruction in the principles of Christianity which the priests so early neglected to give their flocks, it became a necessity to find some substitute which should engage the minds of the worshippers, and gratify the devotional instinct. Thus, independent of the natural tendencies of the human mind to mistake and desire the form for the substance of religion, the *ignorance of the priests* created a necessity for the introduction of ceremony, both as a means to conceal this ignorance, and to supply the people with something calculated to absorb their attention and gratify their feelings in devotional services.

For fifteen centuries every Pope rivalled his predecessor in adding to the ceremonial stock of the Church, until at last the very terms of the Popish ritual would fill

a folio volume larger than the largest lexicon of any European tongue.

This, however, need not be thought very comprehensive for Romanism, when in the Greek Church, according to the report of a late inquirer in its own localities, the present liturgy of this rival of Rome has grown to the enormous dimensions of twenty folio volumes!—*The Greek Church*, by the Rev. G. Waddington.

For the benefit of those who may wish to consult the less gigantic ritual of Romanism, subjoined are the titles of the principal books in which this magazine of superstition is to be found:—

Missale Romanum; the Roman Missal.

Breviarium Romanum; the Roman Breviary.

Rituale Romanum; the Roman Ritual—the Book of Priests' Rites.

Episcopale Romanum; the Roman Episcopal (Ceremonies.)

Pontificale Romanum; the Roman Pontifical (Ceremonies.)

Although the Third Article of the Creed of Pope Pius only expresses a reference to the ritual of the *sacramental* system, this reference of course includes by implication all other ceremonial accompaniments of Romish worship. In no part of this worship has the priest exhibited a more elaborate display of ritual art than in the so-called sacrifice of the Mass—a parody of the sacrifice of the Cross, in which the tree that bore the fruit of human redemption is covered with so dense a “mass” of ceremonial foliage that neither the tree nor its fruit can be discerned.

In the ceremonial of the Mass, the trappings of the altar, the embroidered vestments of the priest, as well as all his motions, looks, and postures, are designed to be significant of an original, between which and the parody there is positively no two things bearing the most remote resemblance. Dispensing with any present reference to the symbolage of the altar or the symbolic livery of the priest, a bare enumeration of the motions, acts, and attitudes of that performer will be sufficient to show the

wonderful transformation which the priest daily effects, not merely in "the wafer," but in the whole service of the simple and scriptural ordinance called the Lord's Supper. The priests' form of the Supper, then, contains:—

65 Operations of folding and unfolding the hands ;

58 Crossings of persons and things ;

44 Genuflexions ;

37 Semi-bows ;

9 Full bows ;

53 Incensings of persons, altar, host, books, &c. ;

29 Altar and other kissings ;

17 Variations in the use of the eyes ;

6 Washings and wipings of hands and fingers ;

3 Beatings of the breast ;

4 Bell ringings ;

3 Acts of lighting and extinguishing candles :

In all, 330 ritual manœuvres in a single Mass!—See *Lewis's Bible, Missal, and Breviary*, vol. i. pp. 60, 61.

While the ritual of Popery in the British dominions may be sufficiently illustrated by the instance of the Mass, the forms of Popish worship on the Continent are so much beyond our experience at home, that we require to be made acquainted with them through such mediums and specimens as the following. The writer is describing one of the Lent services in the church of the Caravita at Rome:—

"The church is spacious, and the number of men present was about five hundred. There were only six or eight small candles ; so that from the first we could only see indistinctly. During prayers two or three attendants entered, each having an *iron hoop on which were suspended about one hundred leathern thongs, which were distributed among the congregation, but some had brought their whips with them.* We examined the thongs, and found them exactly like small English dog-whips, hard, and well-knotted towards the points. After prayers, we had a sermon on the advantages of punishing the body for the good of the soul ; and especially by that sort of penance which is inflicted by means of the whip. During the sermon the lights were extinguished, and the concluding part of it was delivered in total darkness. After the sermon was concluded a bell rang, and there was a slight bustle and hustling as if those present were removing part of their dress ; a second

bell rang, and the *flagellation* commenced. It lasted fully a quarter of an hour; hundreds were certainly flogging something, but whether their own bare backs or the pavement of the church we could not tell. The groaning and crying were horrible, but the scene altogether was perfectly ludicrous. When the flagellation ceased prayers were read, during which the penitents put on their clothes and composed their countenances. Lights were brought in, and the congregation dismissed with the usual benediction."—Thomson's *Facts from Rome*, p. 71.

It may be thought a misnomer to call the frantic exhibition of the Bedlamites who went through the preceding performance *a ceremony*. But the reader knows very little of Romanism if he supposes that the whips above used were employed in any other sense than the ceremonial. The harsh and devout roaring which assailed the writer's ears were significant of bodily pangs only *theatrically* suffered.

When Seneca the moralist ridiculed a similar display of fanaticism which took place in the days of pagan Rome, he sagely said, that "if there be any gods who desire to be worshipped in this manner, they do not deserve to be worshipped at all." This remark is fully more applicable to the gods of Popish than the gods of pagan Rome. If the objects the Papist worships are really pleased with such ceremonial mummary as the priest employs to commend his devotional acts, they must be certainly gratified with a style of worship which even a dignified man would spurn with contempt.

Development of Ritual Popery in the Church of England.

Ever since the days of Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, the leaven of Ritualism which the Reformation unhappily failed to purge fully out of the Church of England, has showed its effects from time to time in such of the clergy as possessed a genius for ecclesiastical pantomime. But until the Tractarian movement, the good sense and spirituality of its many excellent ministers acted as a preservative salt in restraining the progress of ritual corruptions. The present *furor* for ritual exhibitions forms one

of the most remarkable signs of the times. The efforts of the new craftsmen, however, exhibit a great declension in the art. Instead of being, as intended, a second edition of Rome, with amendments, the Tractarian article is conspicuously spurious ; it has not even the merit of symbolage to plead in its favour. The postures, dresses, and other ritualistic efforts of the new performers are purely fantastic, arbitrary, and meaningless. The Romish ritual is the fruit of the dramatic genius of the Italian mind, and the awkward attempts of the English craft to rival this artist in his own peculiar sphere, have only exposed them to the contempt and ridicule of their Popish masters.

After all, it must not be supposed that the Puseyite rivals of Rome are so unwise in their generation as to be carried away by this ceremonial mania without some more solid motive than that which sometimes actuates the ecclesiastical coxcomb. Like their predecessors and patterns in Rome, the Tractarians are fully aware of the

Social and Political Influence of Ritualism.

In all ages and all religions, the first aspiration of priestcraft is a desire for popular reverence. Nor is this reverence sought merely for "the flattering unction" itself. The priest is fully aware of the relationship which exists between popular reverence and the further objects of his ambition. He knows that in popular reverence lie the seeds of that power and wealth which form the other two darling idols of the priestly heart ; and he knows that whatever tends to create or increase the former, will proportionably fructify the seed and produce the fruit which he is so anxious to pluck.

Nothing in Popery has, at least, a more indirect effect in creating this popular homage, and its consequent fruits of secular power and possession, than the imposing religious forms which Popery, or rather priestcraft at large, employs to surround its ministrations with an air of mystery and awe ; nothing so tends to hoodwink the popular intellect and shut out the popular discernment, which Popery experimentally knows to be always detrimental to the good

of the Church. Hence a religion of ceremony is eminently a religion of imposture, and rites have ever proved a most successful handmaid to sacerdotal tyranny in society and the State. When men of the highest intelligence in other respects have unaccountably succumbed to the power of such ritual absurdities as the "Baptism of Bells" and "the Festival of Asses," need we be surprised that this cunning device of Popery has so marvellously influenced the coarse unlettered multitude, and acted as a charm in bringing those impervious to the teaching of spiritual truth to the footstool of an ambitious and unprincipled priesthood?

Fourth Article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

"I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification."

"What is all righteousness that men devise ?

What, but a sordid bargain for the skies !

But Christ as soon would abdicate His throne,

As stoop from heaven to sell the proud His own."

The subjects involved in the contents of the preceding article have already been included in the remarks made under the respective heads of Baptism and Penance,—the only media of justification admitted in the Romish scheme of moral theology. Hence any observations here are merely supplementary to such as have been already made under the respective sacraments referred to.

Popish theology rightly enough divides sin into original and actual. But its system of justification in relation to both these classes of sin presents some of the most obscure and muddled deliverances in Romish theology. This theology notoriously rejects the principle of imputation both in relation to sin and righteousness, and seeks to establish a scheme in which both are alike transmitted to the human race by the process of *infusion*. The distinction between original sin *imputed* and original sin *imparted*, or between the transmission of Adam's guilt and the transmission of Adam's depravity to his offspring, being entirely ignored in the sin-system of the Papacy, we seek in vain

for something intelligible in regard to the efficacy of Rome's baptismal sacrament. This sacrament, she says, removes original sin, but it does not remove "concupiscence," by which she can mean nothing else but the inherent sin which Protestants call natural depravity. Well, if Popish baptism does not remove original sin imputed, seeing that Popery rejects all imputation; and if, according to its teaching, it fails to extirpate the "concupiscence" which constitutes original sin imparted, then what does Popish baptism do? All experience answers, Nothing, and decides by the "logic of facts" that the young Papist, however canonically purified by the oil, salt, and spittle baptism which Popery has substituted for the gospel ordinance, grows up in society with no less propensity to human vice than the unbaptized progeny of the veriest Hottentot or Hindoo.

The sacrament of Penance, the medium of the secondary justification of Popery, similarly discards the idea of imputed righteousness, and professes to communicate the virtue of absolution by an infusive process, wherein not justification but *justice* is transmitted to the soul of the penitent. This justification by infusion is effectually disproved by a sound and adequate definition of justification as founded on that text of the Bible which affords the most complete exhibition of Christ's work in relation to the sinner's pardon,—

2 Cor. v. 21. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

If, according to this text, *justification is simply an exchange of legal relations between Christ and the sinner*, and if Christ was not made guilty by the *infusion* of sin, then in the counterpart man is not justified by the infusion of righteousness. But if Christ could only be made guilty by imputation or by contracting a *guilty* relation to law, then in the counterpart the sinner can only be justified by an imputed righteousness, or one which gives him a *blameless* relation to the same law.

But whatever be the mode in which penance *conveys* justification to the Romanist, it is certain, and this by the

very title of the sacrament, that it can only be procured by works—and works of a penitential or *painful* character—a principle which opportunely leads to some remarks on the

Development of the Doctrine.

No doctrine more satisfactorily illustrates the development of Popery than justification by works. Popery neither originated with the priests alone nor with the people alone: it is the joint product of both. As a knave always tells a fool what the latter *wishes* to believe, so the priest delivered to his flock what the flock liked as a principle of religion. Thus it was when the “foolish Galatians” desired to return to works as a ground of justification, their wishes were fully concurred in by those teachers against whom Paul was so indignant, that he wished they were “even cut off” that thus troubled and perverted their flocks. The priests of Rome, like the Galatian teachers, have married their flocks to two husbands, the *Law* and the *Gospel*. Paul declared that the first husband is dead to the believer that he might be married to another, Rom. vii. 1, &c. But the doctors of Trent, setting aside the Scriptures of Paul, and following the tradition, not of the apostle, but of the Galatians, declare that the Law is still alive, and that he demands “satisfaction” for every violation of his conjugal authority by the spiritual bigamists whom, like the Galatians, he has so unaccountably “bewitched,” Gal. iii. 1.

Social and Political Bearings of the Dogma.

When we consider that on the principle, practice, and maintenance of justice depend the moral well-being of social and political as well as religious institutions and interests, how necessary it is to have right views of this most fundamental and most comprehensive of all moral obligations! The doctrine of justification, as taught by Rome, is not less influential and fruitful in evil in the social and political than in the religious relations of the civil subject. It is not, however, so much from the theological error of justifi-

cation by works, or by a conjunction of works and faith, that this evil so much arises. It is from the doctrine of justification by *priests* that the latter continue to reap the rich harvest of their influence in the social and political world. It is the accredited power of *absolution* which has reared the mighty piles of the priest's wealth, exalted him to the seventh heaven of power and pride, and brought a cringing and fear-stricken laity to prostrate their beslaved carcasses before the conquering car of the Papal Juggernaut.

Hence the folly of all legislative attempts to give social or political freedom to the genuine Papist. No legislative liberality can free this priestly bondsman—no power short of infidelity, or the gospel, can break the manacles which the priest has the accredited power to “bind and loose.” The discoveries which the history of the Papacy have made, with respect to the influence of the absolving power, sufficiently show its influence, not merely in ruling the conduct of individuals, but the affairs of kings and nations.

Fifth Article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

“I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood—which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation. I also confess that, under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.”

“’Tis *finished* ! was His latest voice ;
 These sacred accents o’er,
 He bowed His head, gave up the Ghost,
 And suffered pain no more.

“’Tis finished !—the Messiah dies
 For sins, but not His own,
 The great redemption is complete,
 And Satan’s power o’erthrown !”

Such are the sentiments delivered by Christ himself, with respect to the finished completeness of that sacrificial

work which the sacerdotal officials of Rome profess to act over, and finish again every day in the Mass—the most cunningly devised of all the necromantic feats performed by the priests of Rome. Everything here is calculated to heighten the effect of the great forthcoming act in which the magician of the hour is to invoke the unseen powers, and subject the Divinity himself to the great transubstantiating fiat—*Hoc est corpus meum*. These words, This is my body, or their alleged effects, are substantially the Mass. But the art of Rome has been elaborately exercised to associate this simple sentence of the Mass with a mixture of drama and mystery calculated to excite the highest degree of astonishment and fear in the admiring and awe-struck throng. Bell, book, and candlelight—the operator's ceremonial attire—every attitude, and look, and motion, and word, are pretentiously big with meaning as the magician proceeds to develop the quasi-mysterious and most effective juggle which he ever essays to perform within the charmed circle of the Mother of Harlots.

The Mass has the extraordinary or paradoxical property of being at once a representative and a real sacrifice, the consummating act of the offering being the act in which the priest *eats the victim or wafer!* As all the sacramental and other ordinances of Popery are declared to derive their efficacy from the sacrificial virtue of the Mass, and the whole virtue of the Mass depends upon the sacrificial or else the sacramental act in which the priest eats the breaden victim, the Popish priesthood are endowed with the power of saving the world by the simple and not disagreeable operation of swallowing “wafers!”

It is almost a burlesque on common sense, and much more an insult to Scripture, to attempt anything like a serious refutation of an ordinance which is sagely defined to be “the *bloodless* sacrifice of the body and *blood* of Christ!” The fact is, that the Mass is neither the Lord's Supper nor the Lord's Sacrifice; for if it be the supper it cannot be the sacrifice, and if it be the sacrifice it cannot be the supper, unless two transactions, separated from each other by upwards of forty-eight hours of time, by about as many

furlongs in space, and by agencies as different as Christ and His murderers, are yet one and the same transaction !

The Mass is thus full of contradiction to itself, and is also not merely a contradiction to this or that particular scripture, but to the whole Scripture and the whole plan of redemption ; for if the fulfilment of that plan entirely depends on the completion of the sacrifice of Christ, and if the sacrifice is not yet completed and finished, (as the poet has sung in the paraphrased words of the Saviour,) then redemption is yet in the future, and cannot be completed until the last priest has said the last Mass !

Every mass offered is simply an act of virtual unbelief in the sacrifice of Calvary, as well as a proof that all engaged in it, and trusting to it, are under the curse and power of unjustified sins. For where remission of these is, there is *no more offering for sin*, Heb. x. 18.

The whole Scriptures testify that man is justified by one *offering*, once *offered*, and once *accepted*, and condemn a plurality of justifications, as well as a plurality of sacrifices. "To what purpose then, O Rome ! is the multitude of your sacrifices ?" To no purpose as regards the sinner, but to very great purpose as regards the priests ; for if the priest would answer the question put with a proper regard to truth, he would say, with Demetrius of old, "Ye know that by this craft we have our wealth." Judas sold Christ for thirty pieces of silver, or about thirty half-crowns of our money ; the priest sells Him for one, the present-day market price of a mass being about 2s. 6d. sterling !

The Development of the Mass.

The process by which this sacrifice came to be fabricated has already been partially noticed under the subject of Transubstantiation. A few more remarks may be admitted here. Christ, we are taught by Rome, celebrated the *first Mass*, and afterwards commissioned His "apostles and their successors" to celebrate the same sacrifice to the end of time by the command, "Do this for a commemoration."

We have here what Roman Catholics seldom try to

supply with respect to the development of Popery—namely, the avouched *beginning* of one of their peculiar tenets. But as to the Lord's Supper being the first Mass, this far-fetched idea is easily refuted from the declaration of the apostle made in Heb. viii. 4, "For if He were on earth (and consequently *while* on earth) He should not be a priest," or, as the Douay Bible has it, He "would" not be a priest. Christ therefore could not exercise Himself in any priestly act during His earthly sojourn. It follows that the institutional Supper could be no sacrifice. Every sacrifice on earth requires a priest on earth. But if the apostle teaches that Christ was not a priest on earth—that is, at no period of His earthly career until He realised His priesthood in the act of expiring, or when He had virtually ceased His earthly existence—then the Supper could be no sacrifice, for the simple reason that Christ was then no priest, and being no priest He must have inaugurated the institution of the Supper, not in His priestly, but in His *prophetic* office.

Such being the true account of the Lord's institutional supper, the so-called "first Mass" is found to be simply the first lie upon which the fabricators of the Papacy have built and developed the stupendous pile of sacrificial and sacerdotal error involved in the Mass.

The first Mass having been confessedly instituted without the present ceremonial of altar, dress, and devotional verbiage, Bellarmine finds that the next step in the process of development was taken by the apostle Peter, who, according to tradition, improved the institution of Christ by the *ceremonial system* at present employed by the Church of Rome.

History and tradition are here, as usual, in mutual opposition. History traces the formation of the mass ritualism not to Peter himself, but to Peter's so-called successors, and especially to Gregory I., called the Great, for his great services in this and other departments of Popery. If Gregory did not initiate, he at least systematised the ceremonial which now so effectually conceals the form and signification of the Lord's Supper, that no Roman

Catholic could possibly suppose the existence of any intended relationship between the "first Mass" and its successors, if the priests in the exercise of the highest degree of effrontery and imposture had not called the original by the name of its disgusting caricature.

Although succeeding Popes, after the days of Gregory, continued to trim and fashion the forms, prayers, and paraphernalia of the mass, Gregory is still considered to be the ecclesiastical father of the present-day ritual :—

"The public worship of God was still (in the sixth century) celebrated by every nation in its own language; but its forms were enlarged from time to time, by new prayers and offices, as well as by hymns and psalmody, and such other additions as were found proper to enliven devotion. Gregory introduced a *more imposing method* of administering the communion, with a magnificent assemblage of pompous ceremonies. The institution was called the Canon of the Mass; and such as it appears in the sacramentaries of St Gregory, such word for word, says Fleury, we say it still."—Waddington's *History of the Church*.

In the sixth century, according to the historian quoted, the Mass was still everywhere celebrated in the vernacular tongue; but this intelligent medium shed too much light. The priests wished to extinguish the lingering beams of the Gospel, which still in some degree shone out through the vernacular services of the Mass. Accordingly Pope Vitalian, in the seventh century, decreed that the Mass should only be said in the monkish Latin of the day; and this law was of infinite service in further aiding the priests to conceal the mystery of redemption beneath the load of mummery, which even at that early period hopelessly disguised and disfigured the simple and lucid institution of the original Supper. Paul says :—

1 Cor. xiv. 19. "Yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

The "*five words*" by which the priest professes to operate transubstantiation, the great central act of the Mass, are, "*Enim hoc est corpus meum.*" By the practice of his Church, and as if to spite Paul, the priest virtually says, that he would rather speak these five words in the

unknown tongue he employs, than ten thousand words by which he might instruct his hearers at the Mass!

Pope Honorius III., in the year 1216, initiated the *worship of the Host* in these words:—

“ Priests are to teach their people that when the Host is lifted up at the celebration of the Mass, they should kneel with respect, and that they should also do the same when the priest carries it to any sick.”

Gregory IX., who succeeded him in 1227, in order to make the worship of the Host more sensuously impressive, invented *bell music*, ordering that—

“ When the flesh and blood of Christ is made, and at the elevation of the Host, then should a bell ring, to the end that all who hear it should kneel down and join their hands in adoring the Host.”

The worship of the Host, however, was not fully developed until 1264, when Pope Urban IV. instituted the “Feast of the Sacrament,” now called “Corpus Christi,” or the Festival of the Body of Christ. The following is the account which Mosheim supplies with respect to the origin of this culminating point in the development of the Mass, and its correlative idolatry:—

“ No one will think it strange that after the establishment of the doctrine of transubstantiation, the consecrated bread of the Eucharist should have received divine honours. This having become an established custom, the various ceremonies by which that bread was honoured, followed of course. Hence those splendid caskets in which God, in the form of bread, might reside as in his house, and be carried from place to place; hence lamps and other decorations were added to these reputed domiciles of a present deity; hence this bread came to be carried in splendid processions along the streets to the sick, and other rites of the like character were introduced. This superstition reached its height when the Festival of the Body of Christ, as it is called, was introduced. One Juliana, a nun, who lived at Liege, in the Netherlands, gave out she had been divinely instructed that it was the pleasure of the Lord that an annual feast should be kept in honour of the Holy Supper, or rather of the body of Christ as present in the Holy Supper. Few persons gave credit to her vision. But Robert the Bishop of Liege, in the year 1246 ordered this new festal day, though many were opposed to it, to be celebrated throughout his diocese. After the death of Juliana, her friend Eve, another woman of Liege, ceased not from

prosecuting the business, till at length Urban IV., in the year 1264, imposed that festival upon the whole Church."

The Feast of Corpus Christi was at first celebrated *within the Mass-houses* on the appointed day. But an improvement was subsequently introduced, by which the festival was celebrated without the chapels, and by vast public processions, including an infinite variety of idolatrous paraphernalia and parade, to which the Council of Trent affixed its imprimatur in these words :—

"Whoever shall affirm that Christ the only begotten son of God is not to be adored in the Holy Eucharist, with the *external signs* of that worship which is due to God, and therefore that the Eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly *carried about in processions*, according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of Holy Church, nor *publicly presented to the people for their adoration*, and that those who worship the same are guilty of idolatry, let him be anathema." —Sess. 23, canon 6.

As we are likely to have these idolatrous demonstrations shortly transferred from the Continent to the streets of Britain, those who wish to be pre-informed of the nature of the spectacle should consult controversial works where this most elaborate and idolatrous pageant, as at present practised, may be found described. The following is one of the concluding paragraphs of a lengthy description of this festival, supplied in Elliot's *Delineations of Popery* :—

"Under all these circumstances, the first appearance of the Host in the street is extremely imposing. Encircled by jewels of the greatest brilliancy, surrounded by lighted tapers, and enthroned in a massive yet elegant temple of silver, no sooner has it moved to the door of the Church than the bells announce its presence with a deafening sound; the bands of military music mix their animating notes with the solemn hymns of the singers; clouds of incense rise before the moving shrine; and the ear is thrilled by the loud voice of command, and the clash of the arms which the kneeling soldiers strike down to the ground. When the concealed bearers of the shrine present it at the top of the long street, where the route commences, the multitudes which crowd both the pavements and windows fall prostrate in profound adoration, without venturing to rise up till the object of their awe is out of sight. Flowers are often scattered from the windows, and the most beautiful nosegays adorn the platform of the moveable stage."—P. 192.

The following is an extract from the account of another eye-witness of this undiluted idolatry. At the sound of the procession-bell, all in the reach of hearing must instantly kneel on the bare pavement, and the rule is that the worshipper is not to resume his standing position until he ceases to hear the bell :—

“ Its sound operates like magic on the Spaniards. In the midst of a gay noisy party, the words ‘ *Sa Majestad*,’ (His Majesty,) the term they apply to the Host, will bring every one to his knees until the tinkling dies in the distance. Are you at dinner? you must leave the table. In bed? you must, at least, sit up. On the approach of the Host to any military guard, the drum beats, the men are drawn out, and as soon as the priest can be seen, they bend the right knee and invert the firelocks, placing the point of the bayonet on the ground. As an officer’s guard is always placed at the door of a Spanish theatre, I have often laughed at the effect of the *chamade*, both upon the actors and the company. Dios, Dios, (God, God,) resounds from all parts of the house, and every one falls that moment on his knees. The actor’s ranting, and the rattling of the castanets in the *fandango* is hushed for a few minutes, till the sound of the bell growing fainter and fainter, the amusement is resumed, and the devout performers are once more upon their legs, anxious to make amends for the interruption.”—Doblado’s *Letters from Spain*, p. 19.

Who could have thought that the “first Mass,” so quietly celebrated in an upper room in Jerusalem, and which consisted in the simple act of partaking of a little bread and passover wine, by the disciples of the Saviour—who could have thought that, with all the expansive and transforming power of development, this beautifully simple and significant and impressive anticipation of the Saviour’s passion, could ever have been made the foundation of an enormous street pageant, including a host of armed soldiers and troopers, drowning military music, a cavalcade of gorgeously attired mass priests, bishops, and cardinals, and a multitude of frenzied idolators, worshipping a piece of bejewelled and decorated baker’s paste! Who could have thought that all this ecclesiastical saturnalia should ever be held to constitute a fulfilment of the simple and dying request of the Saviour, “Do this in remembrance of me!”

These will be easily inferred from the relationship which the Mass bears to the various other parts of the Romish system. If there was no Mass, there would be no priests, and hence all the social and secular power which the priest derives from his office is entirely due to the popular belief in the reality and efficacy of the breaden oblation, called the Mass, or the sacrifice of the Mass. The sacrifice so called is, therefore, not only the eminent source of Romish superstition and idolatry, but of that priestly *homage, wealth, and power*, which constitute the triune idol—the very Trinity—of the priest's professional ambition.

No dogma could possibly be more calculated to promote the professional homage which the priest claims from the ordinary mortals whose everlasting fate is made to depend upon his official power. By this dogma, the priest is not only made the depository, but *the creator* of the sinner's salvation ; for all the means of grace, according to Popery, have their efficacy in and from the Mass, and the efficacy of the Mass entirely depends upon the professional will and functions of the Papal sacrificer, who has power at once to create and sacrifice the victim over which he possesses the most arbitrary control. Why, therefore, should not the priest be worshipped instead of the Host ? And can there be a doubt that, with all the expressed profession of worshipping the Host, the priest, being the maker of the Host, and the operating source of salvation to every Papist, *must, in the very nature of things, be the immediate object of religious worship to every Popish idolator.*

But, again, the Mass is not more certainly the grand source of this priestly homage, but the equally productive fountain of that amazing wealth which the priest is able to abstract from prince and pauper by the merchandise of the Mass—a source of wealth to priestcraft, which at one period of the world exceeded the united revenues of all the political states of Europe.

The present state of the Mass trade in Rome may furnish an idea of what the world at large was formerly :—

“ The Roman correspondent of the *Augsburg Gazette* mentions that in the Holy City 800,100*l.* = £33,337 sterling, are spent annually

on masses, while the budget of public instruction amounts to only 214,000f, = £8916 sterling."—*Daily Review*, 2d March 1865.

This abominable traffic in wafer-Christs is sought to be excused in this country, on the ground that the priests of Rome are divested of state endowment, and must for that reason live by the Mass trade. But how hollow this subterfuge is, is clear from the fact that the Mass trade is fully more prevalent and prosperous in Popish states, where priests fatten on endowments, than even in this Protestant kingdom. The tariff or scale of charges for masses has been regulated, not for Protestant, but for *Popish countries*; and the lie which charges this traffic to non-endowment is an additional evidence that among the "marks of the Church" by which Popery claims to be known, the most prominent should have been the scriptural brand of "speaking lies in hypocrisy."

This trade in "the body of Christ" has made the priests the veritable successors of the son of Iscariot, with some compensating difference on the part of Judas. Judas, with all his baseness, was so touched with conviction, that he returned the price of his crime to those from whom he received it. It is not to be expected that the priests of Rome will come to possess the same amount of compunction; but should it be ever experienced, what an amount of fraudulently-extorted wealth will come back to the pockets of the right owners!

It is because the Mass has thus been the pre-eminent source of homage and wealth, that this ordinance has become in a proportionable degree the source of social influence and political power. The superstition which has paid the homage and bestowed the wealth, has not the less invested the priest with social position and political power. The use which the priests made of this power sufficiently proves that they were fully alive to the fact that the Mass was the grand source of it. Hence, of all the "errors" which incurred the wrath of the priest, none was ever visited with heavier penalties than the error of denying the Mass. So many went to the stake for this heresy, that it came to be historically designated the "burning error." What added

immensely to the crime of this error in the eyes of the priest, was the fact that such as deemed the Mass to be either the Lord's Supper or the Lord's sacrifice, were *unanswerable in argument*. We are told that the Brahmin priests require a man to be punished who overcomes them in argument; and their fellow priests of the Papacy have ever punished this crime with the severest of all penalties. It was because the priests of the day could not refute Galileo that he was hurried to a dungeon; and it was because their successors could not disprove the reasoning of Huss and Jerome that both were consigned to the stake.

Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, and the whole host who suffered for this "error" in the short and bloody reign of Mary, were burned, not for the "error" itself, but for the unanswerable logic by which their so-called heresy was sustained. It was not because the martyr Stephen was a follower of Christ, or a denier of the Jewish creed—it was because "they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake," that his persecutors hounded on the murderers who stoned to death the first martyr. Although the fangs have been extracted from the jaws of Popery, the priests never fail to resort to the exercise of such power as they possess, to crush this heresy of argument. We have not yet been privileged to experience a *Corpus Christi* procession in this land, but when the day comes in which Popery shall feel itself sufficiently strong to inaugurate this idolatrous appurtenance of the Mass, Protestants may expect to feel the force of the priest's power in some such fashion as the following. Professor S. Morse, of the University of New York, having once witnessed the celebration of the *Corpus Christi* at Rome, writes :—

"I was a stranger in Rome, and recovering from the debility of a slight fever; I was walking for an air and gentle exercise in the Corso, on the day of the celebration of Corpus Domini. From the houses on each side of the street were hung rich tapestries and gold embroidered damasks, and toward me slowly advanced a long procession, decked out with all the heathenish paraphernalia of this self-styled Church. In a part of the procession a lofty baldichino or canopy, borne by men, was held above the idol, the Host, before

which, as it passed, all heads were uncovered and every knee bent, but mine. Ignorant of the customs of heathenism, I turned my back to the procession, and close to the sides of the houses in the crowd (as I supposed unobserved,) I was noting in my tablets the order of the assemblage. I was suddenly aroused from my occupation, and staggered by a blow upon the head from a gun and bayonet of a soldier, which struck off my hat far into the crowd. Upon recovering from the shock, the soldier, with the expression of a demon, and his mouth pouring forth a torrent of Italian oaths, in which *il diavolo*, had a prominent place, stood with his bayonet against my breast. I could make no resistance; I could only ask him why he struck me, and receive in answer his fresh volley of unintelligible imprecations, which having delivered, he resumed his place in the *guard of honour* (to the Host) by the side of the officiating cardinal.” —*Foreign Conspiracy against the Liberties of the United States*, p. 172.

This treatment of Protestants who refuse to be idolators of the Host being so well known now at home, the Popish papers are now and then seeking to defend it in some such apologies as the following :—

“In Spain the viaticum (that is, the wafer-god) is always carried *in public* to the sick, and it is the custom to kneel down when the priest passes. Some take a light and follow it a little way, and you are requested to place lights in the windows or the balconies as it passes. Surely an *Englishman* may at least take off his hat, and bow in politeness to the people, who believe that God (the Host) is insulted by his not doing so, and if one more violent or enthusiastic *were to strike off his hat, would he not deserve it?*”—*Weekly Register*, 31st March 1866.

Such is the social and political tyranny which ever follows the full and unrestrained development of Popery in every State where it exists. And as wherever it exists it can never by its principles cease till it acquires the power to put these principles in practice, we may expect that the same tyranny which it exercises towards Protestants abroad, will be set up at home just in proportion as it acquires the ability to persecute.

Sixth Article of the Creed.

“I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls t herein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.”

As Popery sometimes rejoices in the antiquity of her

doctrines, Protestants may freely concede that Purgatory, at least, has all the merit of a hoary existence. Take Virgil's description of it long before the birth of Christianity :

“ For this the souls a various penance pay
To *purge* the taint of former crimes away ;
Some in the sweeping breezes are refined,
And hang on high to whiten in the wind ;
Some cleanse their stains beneath the gushing streams,
And *some rise glorious from the scorching flames*.
Thus all must suffer, and these sufferings past,
Their clouded minds are purified at last.
But when the circling seasons as they roll
Have cleansed the dross long gathered round the soul,
When the celestial fire, divinely bright,
Breaks forth victorious in her native light,
Then *we, the chosen few, Elisium gain*,
And there expatiate on the blissful pain.”

The Fathers of Trent observed a prudent reserve in dealing with the subject of Purgatory. They felt satisfied to declare that “there is a Purgatory,” and liberally allowed the individual teachers of the Church to mould the more particular features of the doctrine according to their respective opinions.

Hence we are indebted to the ordinary teachers of the Church for such information as may be derived by inquirers in relation to the more particular faith of the Church on this fiery tenet. Happily the doctors of the Church have been more than usually communicative in reference to the properties and effects of Purgatory. It is a salutary but yet most excruciating fire, which effects two objects in preparing the soul for heaven. That is, it supplements and supplies the defects of the sacrament of Penance by inflicting the temporal punishment due to mortal sin, but not remitted by that sacrament, or redeemed by works of satisfaction performed in this life ; and again, it supplements and supplies the defects of Extreme Unction, by cleansing the soul from such venial sins as may happen to escape the purifying efficacy of that sacrament. In short, Purgatory completes the double process of justification and sanctification, which, according to the Gospel system, are

respectively effected by the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit.

If this be a true representation of purgatorial efficacy, it becomes a question how masses, and other means employed by the Church, can be beneficial to the souls in Purgatory. For if the soul has a certain amount of legal penalty to be discharged, or a certain amount of sin to be purified by purgatorial suffering, then the degree and duration of the suffering must, of course, be in proportion to the debt and impurity which are to be removed by the purgatorial process. The full extent of this process is necessary to the moral perfection of the soul. Any counter operation, therefore, effected by masses or other means, with a view either to diminish the intensity or shorten the duration of an agency necessary to perfect the justification or the sanctification of the soul, must, as a consequence, interfere with the salutary effects of the "blessed fire," and become a proportional injury instead of a benefit to the purgatorial patient.

But however the doctrine may thus involve the principle of its own refutation, it is certain that the Roman Catholic Purgatory is not only refuted by the Scriptures, but effectively by those very Scriptures which Rome adduces in support of this dogma. In the chief of these passages (Matt. v. 21-23) we read of an offence which is subject to the penalty of a tribunal called "the judgment," of another, subject to the penalty of a tribunal called "the council," and a third sin, which is liable to the penalty of "hell-fire." "Here," says Priest Keenan, "Christ points out three sins, and only one of the three," he says, "deserves damnation."—*Controversial Catechism*, p. 151. If there had been only *two* sins—that is, two classes of sins (for the particular sins referred to are representative of classes)—the passage would have answered admirably to sustain the distinction between venial and mortal sin, and the consequent distinction between Purgatory and hell. But, unfortunately for the infallible reference to the passage, there are *three* classes of sins referred to instead of two, and consequently (if we interpret the passage on the prin-

ciple of the priest) there must be *three* places of punishment in the other world instead of two. How infallibility blunders ! Take another specimen of the same attempt to “wrest the Scripture:”—

Matt. v. 25, 26. “Be at agreement with thy adversary betimes, whilst thou art in the way with him, lest perhaps the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Amen, I say to thee, thou shalt not go out therein till thou hast paid the last farthing.”—*Douay Bible*.

The adversary here, of course, represents God ; the prison, says the Church of Rome, is Purgatory ; and the farthings are venial sins. But venial sins being only “farthing matters” in the Church of Rome, cannot, according to the Roman Catholic Bishop Doyle, make God “an adversary ;” they cannot even break charity between man and man, much less between man and God.”—Doyle’s *Abridgement of Christian Doctrine*.

Hence, if the *character of the sin must here determine the character of the prison*, it follows, upon the showing of the Church of Rome herself, that as the sin here referred to makes God an adversary, and for that reason must be “a mortal sin,” the prison referred to must be the prison appropriated to the punishment of the same sin—that is, it must be the prison of hell, and not Purgatory.

Take another specimen of the way in which infallibility succeeds in self-refutation :—

In Matt. xii. 33, we read of a sin which shall neither be forgiven in this world nor “the world to come.” “Here,” says the Roman Catholic note on the passage, “we gather that some sins may be remitted in the world to come, and consequently that there is a Purgatory.” But, according to Matt. v. 26, already examined, sins must be “*paid* to the very last farthing.” How sins are *forgiven* in the world to come, and, at the same time, *paid* to the very last farthing, we leave it to Popish logic to answer, for certainly no other logic can.

The deduction, however, to be drawn from the Saviour’s words in the passage under notice is not that “some sins,”

but that *all* sins except one, the sin against the Holy Spirit, might obtain forgiveness in "the world to come," which, the Douay Bible says, means Purgatory. Are, then, all sins except one forgiven in Purgatory? Certainly not. According to Popish theology, no mortal sin can be forgiven or remitted there. Hence, as all mortal sins except one were to be pardonable in "the world to come," of which Christ spoke, and as no mortal sin can be forgiven in Purgatory, it follows that Purgatory and "the world to come" cannot be the same place.

In this way, if space permitted, it could be easily shown that every text of Scripture which Popery advances to maintain a purgatorial fire, contains a refutation of that dogma. With respect to the last passage referred to, it may be added, that our authorised Bible contains a flaw in the translation which the Popish Bible did not, as in other cases, seek to correct. "Neither in this world nor the world to come," should have been rendered, according to the Greek, "Neither in this *age*, nor in the *age* to come;" that is, according as the Jews understood these phrases, neither in the Mosaic age or dispensation, nor yet in the Messianic or Christian dispensation, the dispensation in which the Jews were led to expect the highest degree of prerogatives and privileges.

Once more, the annotators of the Douay Bible find a Purgatory in

1 Pet. iii. 19, 20. "In which also coming he preached to those spirits which were in prison, which had been sometimes incredulous when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noah," &c.

If these verses refer to the saints in Purgatory, and teach that Christ preached to them after His death, how is it that the passage confines the preaching of Christ to the *ante-diluvians* in Purgatory? Were not the *post-diluvians*, or those who lived and died between the flood and the coming of Christ, and who, according to the judgment of the Church of Rome, however holy, could not enter heaven till the Saviour suffered—were not these equally if not

more deserving of a similar deliverance by Christ? And if so, how is it that Peter and the whole New Testament so carefully omit all allusion to these comparatively deserving sufferers, while making such a special reference to the guilty infidels who died by the vengeance of the flood, and who, for that reason, could not, according to the teaching of Popery itself, be admissible to Purgatory at all? Has tradition preserved no answer to this question?

Development of the Dogma.

As usual, Popery has drawn upon the resources of paganism for the idea and establishment of this dogma. All pagan countries which had attained to a belief in a future existence with rewards and punishment, fell upon the device of Purgatory as the only means in which human wisdom, ignorant of salvation by Christ, could discover such a mode of purification from sin as would secure them a happy futurity. This idea was so much matured in the days of pagan Rome, that papal Rome, as we have seen by the lines quoted from Virgil, had little more to do than to borrow the doctrine from her pagan ancestry, and incorporate it almost unchanged among the novelties which she now calls "developments."

The Christian Church, however, did not hastily appropriate this piece of paganism. Development is an insidious growth. The seed is almost indigenous, and lies long hidden. From the seed "first comes the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." The development of Purgatory is founded on a practice which, although pursued at first apart from the most remote idea of a Purgatory, yet speedily came to involve that doctrine and its associations. This was the practice of *praying for the dead*. It will be asked, if the early Christians prayed for the dead, what was the object of such prayers if not to procure relief or release from the penal sufferings included in the idea of a Purgatory. The answer is easily given. The Apocalypse of St John contains a reference to a first and second resurrection; and however the notion came to be entertained, it appears pretty eviden

that the later Jews and earlier Christians alike came to believe in the possibility of a retarded, and perhaps of a wholly forfeited, resurrection to some who died in a less perfect state of sanctification. Hence the practice of praying for the dead, with the hope that such prayers might be effectual as regards the interests of an early or certain resurrection. This fact is of much importance in the Papal controversy, as delivering a passage of the apocryphal Scriptures from the false application which Popery has constantly and confidently made of it to support a Purgatory :—

2 Maccabees xii. 43, 44. “And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifices to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously *concerning the resurrection*; for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should *rise again*, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.”

The Church of Rome has corrupted the passage ; but it yet remains clear that the benefit sought for the dead in this case was not a deliverance from Purgatory, but a deliverance from the grave, or from the penalty of either an impeded or an altogether inhibited resurrection.

The same idea is first broached in the third century by Tertullian, when he says—

“No one will doubt that the soul pays something in the lower world without (or deprived of) a plenitude of the *resurrection by the flesh also*.”

The idea is, that the soul may be made subject to the penalty for sin either by a delayed or denied resurrection of the body in connection with the spirit.

Tertullian seems further to hold a process of purification, but he admits that he received the idea from Montanus, the celebrated heretic of this period. Montanus being the *first* in the Christian Church to whom the idea of a Purgatory can be traced, when the Church of Rome professes to derive this doctrine by tradition from the Fathers, Protestants need not deny the fact, the tradition being the tradition of Fathers Montanus and Tertullian, both pronounced heretics by the Papacy itself.

In the third century, Origen, the celebrated presbyter of Alexandria, professedly deriving his views from 1 Cor. iii. 12-15, broached the idea of a Purgatory which should *follow the general judgment*, when all should pass through the fire destined to "try every man's works," and come out purified from whatever moral dross should be found in the soul. Such a Purgatory could offer no inducement to make it acceptable to the priesthood, as it afforded no occasion for the exercise of their power beyond the grave. Hence it received no encouragement from the officials of the Church, and, in fact, was suppressed as a heresy. Origen's Purgatory, however, was only suppressed, to be revived with such improvements as answered the sinister designs of rising Popery. It was taught that the fiery trial was to follow the *particular judgment* succeeding death, and not the *general judgment* of the last day. It never occurred to the priests, nor has it occurred effectively yet, that if God passes a judgment upon the soul after death, that judgment cannot be set aside or modified by prayers or masses, unless the priest has power to revoke the sentence which has passed the lips of Omnipotence.

The notion of a Purgatory being once originated, like other novelties, favouring the exaltation of the priesthood, gradually leavened the Church from the fourth century onward. As the doctrine, however, had not even a plausible Scripture basis, it became necessary to support it by other means. The chief of these means was alleged *revelations* from the dead; and the chief propagator of these revelations was no less a personage than Pope Gregory I., or "the Great," who occupied the Papal see at the close of the sixth century. These revelations are recorded by Gregory in the Fourth Book of his Dialogues, and were found so effectual in proving the existence of a Purgatory, that the development of the doctrine was henceforth rapidly forwarded by similar means.

Mosheim, in referring to the progress of the doctrine by these means, up to the tenth century, says—

"The fears of Purgatory were now carried to the greatest height,

and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehensions of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter easily by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints; while from the pains of Purgatory there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority, and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them; and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied by *monstrous fables and fictitious miracles*, they laboured to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a prevailing influence in that formidable region.”—Century 10, part 2, chap. 3.

It would be endless to supply even specimens of the “old wives’ fables,” and the “lying wonders,” brought into requisition to establish this dogma. Platina, in his life of Pope Benedict, supplies a specimen of those employed in the eleventh century, which is worthy of notice from its peculiarity. The dead Pope appeared to a traveller in his own body, but with the ears and tail of an ass, and other animal deformities. The traveller ventured to ask him the reason of so beastly a transformation. “My deformity,” replied the pontiff, “is the reward of my polluted life.” The Pope, according to his biographer, was further doomed to be dragged, till the day of judgment, through thorns and filth, and in regions exhaling stench and sulphur and fire.—See Edgar’s *Variations of Popery*, p. 482.

St Bernard, in the twelfth century, called “the last of the Fathers,” endorses similar revelations touching the verity of Purgatory and its purifying power.

But the most detailed and credited and influential accounts from Purgatory, as it was believed in during the middle ages, are those contained in the *Golden Legend*, a work of the thirteenth century, of the highest repute, and one that was then publicly read in the Church service instead of the Bible. The following short extract will give an idea of the whole legend. The part quoted refers to a Popish holiday called “All-Souls Day :”—

“The memory of the departure of all Christian souls is established to be solemnised in the Church on this day, to the end that they may have general aid and comfort. . . .

“Peter Damiens says that in the Isle of Vulcan, St Odille heard the voices and the howlings of devils, which complained strongly

because that the souls of them that were dead were taken away from their hands by alms and prayers," &c.

If Rome could apologise for this and similar productions, by ascribing them to the age of darkness in which they appeared, the apology might disarm the hostility of some of her opponents. But such an apology is rendered impossible by the fact, that instead of her doctors and theologians of the enlightened times since the Reformation being ashamed of the past impostures of the Church, the most eminent among them have striven rather to emulate than excuse the lying legends by which this doctrine came to be developed and established in the Church.

Cardinal Bellarmine in the sixteenth century, and one of the ablest and most approved champions of the Papacy, of course laboured to draw from the Scriptures and tradition all the argument he could to support a Purgatory; but feeling his shortcomings in this way, he does not fail to resort to the old trick of visions and revelations, to produce confidence in an article of faith which he must have known could not be sustained by any appeal to Scripture, or even tradition :—

“Since many persons,” says the Cardinal, “will not believe what they have never seen, it has pleased God sometimes to raise His servants from the dead, and to send them to announce to the living what they have really beheld.”

The Cardinal by these remarks, in his work *De Purgatorio*, is referring to certain revelations, which he supplies in another work, and of which one is here given :—

“A pious father in Northumberland died after a long illness, but to the great terror of those who watched by his body, came to life again at the dawn of the following day. All but his faithful and affectionate wife fled at the sight of him ; and to her he communicated, in the most soothing terms, the peculiar circumstances of his case; that he had, indeed, been dead, but was permitted to live again upon earth, though by no means in the same manner as before. In short, he sold all his property, divided the produce equally between his wife, his children, and the poor, and then retired to the Monastery of Melrose. He there lived in such a state of unexampled mortification as made it quite evident, even if he had not said a word upon the subject, that he had seen things,

whatever was the nature of them, which no one else had been permitted to behold."

But he disclosed all to the following effect :—

"One," said he, "whose aspect was light, and his garment glistening, conducted me to a valley of great depth and width, but of immeasurable length; one side of which was dreadful beyond expression for its burning heat, and the other for its no less intolerable cold. Both were filled with the souls of men, which seemed to be tossed, as by the fury of a tempest, from one side to the other; for being quite unable to endure the heat on the right hand, the miserable wretches kept throwing themselves to the opposite side into the equal torment of cold, and thence back again into the raging flames. This, thought I, must be hell, but my guide answered to my thought, that it was not so. 'This valley,' said he, 'is the place of torment for the souls of those who, after delaying to confess and expiate their sins, have at length, in the article of death, had recourse to penance, and so have died. These, at the day of judgment, will all be admitted into the kingdom of heaven by reason of their confession and penance, late as it was. But meanwhile, many of them may be arrested and liberated before that day by the prayers, alms, and fastings of the living, particularly by *the sacrifice of the mass.*'"

Popery ever evinces what almost appears to be a studied opposition to Scripture. Christ himself has solemnly assured us, that if "we hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will we be persuaded though one rose from the dead." But Popery thinks otherwise; and the Cardinal's fabricated story involves as flagrant opposition to the teaching of the Saviour as the dogma which the story was employed to support.

The doctrine of a Purgatory having, by these and similar means, become a general belief in the Church in the fifteenth century, measures were taken at that period to constitute it an article of faith. By the terms of the temporary union of the Greek and Latin Churches, effected by the Council of Ferrara, the subject of Purgatory was to be decided according to the most authentic teaching of both Churches. The Council of Ferrara or of Florence, to which city the sittings of the Council were subsequently removed, was called by Pope Eugenius in 1437.

"Arrived in due season at the appointed city, Ferrara, a trifling

difference first arose respecting the seats to be respectively occupied during the conference by its spiritual and temporal presidents. But this was arranged by a compromise, by which the Pope conceded part of his claim, but retained his pre-eminence. They were placed on different sides of the church, but the Pope was on the right and his throne was one step higher than that of the Emperor.

"It was settled that the subject of the first discussion should be *Purgatory*."—Waddington's *History of the Church*, p. 621. Ed. 1833.

The historian then goes on to state that Cardinal Julian introduced the subject by stating the doctrine as it was then held by the Latin Church. To this view of the doctrine the Greeks objected. But although the two Churches were not found to be fully unanimous on the subject of Purgatory, even at the subsequent discussions in the Council of Florence (1439), yet the Church of Rome regards the decisions of that Council to have so far settled the doctrine in her favour, as to constitute it thenceforth an article of faith.

The Council of Trent confirmed the decree of the Council of Florence in its twenty-fifth session. But without venturing, as in other cases, to improve the teaching of its predecessors, by casting the doctrine into a more precise and explicit theological mould, the Trent fathers, as already said, merely declared that "there is a Purgatory." The Creed of Pope Pius simply reiterates this proposition, and has left the priest to explain the dogma.

Social and Political Relations of the Dogma.

The great characteristic of all the dogmas which go to form the Creed of Pope Pius IV.—the one principle which runs supremely through the whole of the articles—is the secular exaltation of the priesthood through the acquisition of wealth and power. Perhaps no article of the Creed ever contributed to the advancement of this design more effectually than the article which teaches that "there is a Purgatory," and that the priest has power to "remit or retain sins" in this future state of existence, as well as in the present life. Had the efficacy of masses, indulgences, and the sacraments been confined to *this life*—had the priest's

office been merely to make men holy *here*, his utmost ambitious efforts would have scarcely availed him to reach the lowest instead of the topmost step in the ladder of power.

Purgatory, by the adroit teaching of the priest, is made the great *hope*, as well as the great *fear* of the Romanist. It is precisely because the doctrine combines a desirable good, as well as an apprehended evil, that the priests have been enabled to trade so successfully upon this dogma. But how is it the great “hope” as well as the great “fear” of the “faithful?” It is the great fear because the teaching of the priest has invested the doctrine with the most terrific apprehension of punishment ; and it is the great hope, because, however great this fear, Purgatory cancels a greater fear—the fear of hell.

Hence all the moral influence by which the apprehension of eternal punishment is so much calculated to restrain the wickedness of humanity, is completely obliterated by the doctrine of purgatorial salvation. The evidence of the Rev. John Burnet, given before the House of Lords previous to the passing of the Catholic Relief Act, sufficiently accounts for the prevalence of a certain class of Irish crime :—

“There are (said he) Catholic books in general circulation in the country (Ireland), that are subversive of every principle of morality and religion. . . . They prescribe certain forms to be gone through in their devotions, and they connect with these prayers and these forms speedy release from Purgatory. The lower orders of the Roman Catholics believe this, and feel and act upon the belief of it. The effect of which is, that no Roman Catholic of the lower orders has any dread of final perdition. I have spoken with them frequently on the subject, and *never found one of them that supposed he could go to hell*. If they die in mortal sin, their doctrine is they must go to perdition. If, however, they apply for absolution to the priest, he must give it ; and in the case of absolution, which is administered on their professing a regret for their sins, they only go to Purgatory, and they depend on those books of forms for their release from it ; and hence the punishments of futurity, in their estimation, are only temporary punishments, and this conviction has a very injurious effect upon the views and conduct of the people.”—*Evidence before the Lords*, p. 240.

If the criminality of “the lower orders of Catholics” is

thus so much encouraged by the virtual substitution of Purgatory for hell, how much more must human iniquity be encouraged among the rich and prosperous of the Church, who can so amply avail themselves of the benefits of those numerous antidotes, which remove not merely the fear of hell, but the fear of Purgatory. As Purgatory is the great antidote to the fear of hell, and as masses or indulgences are a similar antidote to the fear of Purgatory, it follows that where these means can be liberally paid for, the fear of both hell and Purgatory is set at nought, and the sinner is encouraged to harden himself in courses of iniquity. The priesthood, being the arbitrary dispensers of all the means necessary to secure deliverance from the purgatorial fire, the God of heaven and hell is made a far less object of hope and fear than the priest, or the god of Purgatory. The grand aim of this superstition is *pelf*. The Pope alleges that his commission to carry and use "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," extends with the same force and effect to the kingdom of Purgatory—that his power "to bind and loose," or to "retain and remit" sins in this world, extends with the same unlimited and arbitrary authority to the next. But the Pope ignores the part of his commission which commands him to "freely give" what he "freely received," and he never by any chance applies his key to the gates of Purgatory without a *quid pro quo*—or an abominable consideration for release or relief of the purgatorial prisoners. As before noticed, the common defence for the mass-trade in this country is that Popery has here no Government endowment, and that hence the priests are obliged to resort to this spiritual traffic as a means of support. This would give all dissenters an equal excuse for dealing in sacred merchandise. The Protestant minister is paid for his *office*, and not for the *article* which he administers. The priest, *although* paid for his office, charges for "the article" to boot. This is evident by the fact that masses are not less sold in Popish states, where the priests are endowed, than in Protestant, where they are not.

When this groundless defence fails, others equally hollow

are freely and effectually employed to cover the iniquity. Thus Gother, in his popular defence of Popery, called *The Papist Misrepresented*, says, in relation to the priest's trade,—

“Such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or to give alms or *procure masses for their relief*, are not neglected by the Church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass.”

But the masses being a “general commemoration,” are said for the poor and rich *in common*. Extra or special masses, which are said *only for extra or special pay*, either bring extra benefit to the payer, or they do not. If they do not, then the rich are swindled; if they do, then those who can pay have a manifest advantage over those who cannot, and, instead of it being hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, the case becomes hard for the poor and easy for the rich.

The priests, however, have devised a modern plan by which even the poor may be enabled to abbreviate or alleviate the pains of Purgatory, either for themselves or friends, and upon terms which, if not extending the benefit to those who *most* require it—the absolute paupers of the Church—at least offers the boon for the low consideration of a “Peter’s penny.” This bright *conceptio* has been realised in the

Development of Joint-Stock Purgatorian Societies.

In the *Quarterly Review* for 1818, p. 109, there is an account of one of these societies, established in London in 1810. This appears to be the first of its class; but since then the plan has been adopted with great success elsewhere. The following are some of the more prominent features of such a society, established in St James’s parish, city of Dublin :—

“PURGATORIAN SOCIETY.

“Instituted July 1st, 1813, and held in St James’s Chapel.

“In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins," (2 Macc. xii. 46.)

"The members who compose 'the Society of the Office for the Dead,' commenced on the above day at the said place, adopting the spirit and meaning of the sacred text, and working in conformity to the divine precepts of the Holy Catholic Church, to extend their charitable views beyond the grave, by relieving, as far as in them lies, *the suffering souls in Purgatory*, and inviting all tender-hearted Catholics who have a feeling sensibility of the duty they owe their departed parents, relations, and friends, who probably may stand more in need of their commiseration at present than at any period of their lifetime, to assist in the charitable and pious purpose of *shortening the duration of their sufferings by the most easy means imaginable*, have agreed to and adopted the following rules:—

"Rule 1. That the affairs of this institution shall be regulated by the Superior, Rectors, and six of the members who compose the Office for the Dead, who shall attend on every Wednesday night, at half-past eight o'clock, throughout the year, at the above-named place, or any other place which may hereafter be appointed, and there, with attention and devotion, recite the Office for the Dead, agreeable to the intention that shall then be mentioned.

"Rule 2. That every well-disposed Catholic, wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering souls in Purgatory, *shall pay one penny per week, which shall be appropriated to the procuring of masses*, to be offered up for the repose of the souls of the deceased parents, relations, and friends of all the subscribers to the institution in particular, and the faithful departed in general."

"Rule 7. That every member of the Office for the Dead, who serves the Society in the capacity of Superior, shall, at the time of his death, be entitled to *three masses* to be offered for the repose of his soul; and also every member who serves the office of Rector shall be entitled to the benefit of *two masses*; and every subscriber, without distinction, shall be entitled to the benefit of *one mass* each, provided that such member or subscriber shall die a *natural death, be six months a member of the institution, and be clear of all dues at the time of their departure*," &c.

After two more rules, this singular document closes with the business-like announcement:—

"The books to be opened for the inspection of subscribers.

"J. COYNE, Printer.

"Price Threepence."

Rule 7 of this Purgatorian Club contains a provision or two worthy of notice. That such dead members as had

not "paid *all dues* at the time of their departure" should be deprived of the benefits of the Club is quite consistent with the money-making object of Purgatory; but why the Church should restrict her *post-mortem* aid to such only as die a "natural death" is hardly to be guessed. One would think that the soldier who dies in battle, or the penitent criminal appointed to execution, would be some of the most likely to attract the commiseration of the Church, and be allowed to participate in the benefits of this unique "Co-operative Society."

Those who wish to see even the preceding purgatorial scheme excelled may consult Doblado's *Letters from Spain*, from which an extract or two is subjoined, including a reference to

Purgatorian Lotteries.

"At the conclusion of our entertainment, we heard the church-bell toll what in Spain is called *Las animas*, (the souls.) A man bearing a large lantern, with a painted glass on which was represented two naked persons *enveloped in flames*, entered the court, addressing every one of the company in these words, 'The holy souls, brother! remember the holy souls!' Few refused the petitioner a copper coin, worth about the eighth part of a penny. This custom is universal in Spain. . . .

"The tenderness of all sorts of believing Spaniards for the souls in Purgatory, and the reliance they place on their intercession with God, would almost be affecting, did it not originate in the most superstitious credulity."

It is a theological decision insisted on by the priests, that the souls in Purgatory cannot pray in their *own behalf*; while, according to the preceding account, the Romanist is taught that they are capable, and with great effect, of interceding for *the living*. By this crafty piece of theological science, a double end is answered—first, an increased sympathy is excited in behalf of those in Purgatory, whose total inability for *self-help* greatly enhances the influence of the priest's appeal for the help of masses; second, this appeal for the help of masses is made still more efficacious by the appeal to *selfishness* involved in the teaching that the souls in Purgatory, although prohibited the power of praying for themselves, are effectual intercessors for their *benefactors* (or

those who seek to aid them) on earth. No two motives could possibly be more effectual as means of extracting money for masses than the combined sympathy and selfishness involved in this teaching.

“The religious ingenuity of the Catholics (in relation to Purgatory) has gone so far as to publish the *scheme of a lottery*, for the benefit of such souls as might otherwise escape their notice. It consists of a large sheet of paper fixed in a frame, with an open box beneath it. Under different heads, numbered from one to ninety, the inventor of this pious game has distributed the most interesting cases which can occur on the debtor’s side of the purgatorial Newgate, allotting to each a prayer, penance, or offering. In the boxes are deposited ninety pieces of card, distinguished by numbers corresponding to the ninety classes. According as the pious gambler draws the tickets, he performs the meritorious works enjoined in the scheme—generally a short prayer or slight penance—transferring their spiritual value to the favourite souls to whom each card belongs.”

Purgatorial Swindling.

According to the ordinary understanding of the laity, the Popish clergy undertake to give a fair equivalent in spiritual benefits for a stipulated temporal consideration; and it is certain that they do *undertake* to perform the contract of an equitable barter. But the priests are not always satisfied to extort money even on the easy terms of “saying masses,” and both the legislation of the Council of Trent, and occasional practical divulgements, give us to understand that in many cases masses thus paid for are *never performed at all*.

The Council of Trent, in its twenty-fifth session, being fully apprised of the existence of this species of swindling, was obliged to make a special legislative provision to prevent a style of ecclesiastical robbery which was so much calculated to destroy public confidence in the fidelity of the priests:—

“Bishops are enjoined to provide that the suffrages of living believers—that is to say, the sacrifices of masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which have usually been performed by the faithful for other deceased faithful persons—*should be piously and devoutly performed*, according to the institutions of the Church; and that whatsoever is due on their behalf, either on account of

the bequests of testators or from any other source, *should be discharged* (not as a matter of course, but) *diligently and accurately by the priests and ministers of the Church, and by others who are bound to perform this office.*"

The species of dishonesty to which this canon was directed did not, however, disappear from the Church; and numerous revelations have made it evident that this class of simonious robbery is by no means uncommon even at the present day. Our illustration is selected from the proceedings of a

Purgatorial Lawsuit.

As Spain is "eminently Catholic," it is in consequence eminently purgatorial. Hence it affords the best illustrations of the religious and social effects of a dogma which so permeates Spanish society as to become commingled with the most earthly affairs. A writer from Spain supplies the following account of a lawsuit which originated out of the doctrine of Purgatory and priestly turpitude:—

"I was greatly amused by the history of a lawsuit that was pending while I was at Alicant. A certain rich proprietor having died about six months, left money to the Church sufficient to purchase twelve thousand masses for his soul. But after a few of these had been said, the masses were discontinued, and the process was brought by the heir to recover the sum left for the masses—the Church having failed to fulfil the condition upon which the money was bequeathed. The defence set up was sufficiently singular. Those upon whom the duty of saying these masses devolved, willing to be excused from the labour, interceded with the bishop, who interceded with his Holiness the Pope. The set-off against (the pursuer's) claim was the production of the Pope's letter, which declared by his sovereign authority that the celebration of *twelve masses* should have the same effect, and be as beneficial to the soul of the deceased, as the celebration of twelve thousand masses. The decision upon the case had not been given when I left Alicant; but as it involved a question touching the Pope's spiritual power, the probabilities are that his Holiness would prove an overmatch for the heir."—Inglis's *Spain in 1830*, vol. ii., pp. 234, 235, second edition.

Deathbed Power of Purgatory.

The circumstances under which this powerful engine of priestcraft exerts its most efficacious and fatal influence on

society, are those of the deathbed chamber. It is by appeals to the dying, in which the terrors of Purgatory and the power of the priest to quench its penal fires are skilfully exhibited, that the Church has been enabled to fill her coffers, to found her colossal cathedrals and her monastic halls, to endow her colleges, and send her troops of well-equipped missionaries to all quarters of the world.

The doctrine of salvation *by* Purgatory may be consolatory to the poor Romanist, but the doctrine of salvation *from* Purgatory, can bring consolation only to the rich. The history of Whitby—a history illustrative of this dogma in the palmy days of the Papacy—furnishes several cases like the following :—

“To all the sons of Holy Mother Church, Thomas de Colville, greeting. Know ye that I have granted, and by this my charter confirmed for a perpetual alms, the donation which Alan de Percy made to the Church of St Peter and St Hilda at Whitby, and to the monks of that place serving God ; namely, two carucates of land, the one in Oxenham and the other in Hetune, for the *redemption of my soul, and for the salvation of my ancestors.*”

The dying liberality of the grandees of Spain is conspicuously exemplified in the case of Philip V. :—

“Philip V. ordered by his will all the priests of the place where he should die to say mass the same day for the repose of his soul ; besides which they were to celebrate, during three days before privileged altars, as many masses as possible. And that he might not fail in his purpose, he further commanded a *hundred thousand masses* to be said on his behalf ; the surplus of as many as were necessary to conduct him to heaven (being made) reversible to poor solitary souls, concerning whom no person bestowed a thought.”
—Bourgoing’s *Modern Spain*, iv. p. 273.

Notwithstanding the errors with which Roman Catholics charge the memory of Henry VIII., it must not be supposed that these errors were the fruits of the Protestant religion, as nothing is more clear than that Henry died an orthodox believer in all those dogmas which the Church of Rome holds to be necessary to salvation. The *Church Review* of September 1865 produces evidence sufficient

to attest this fact, in the subjoined extract which the Review supplies from the "State Papers :"—

"Md. That on Sunday the 13th day of February, [1547,] and the day afore the removing, there was sung in the chapel of the palace where the corpse remained, *three solemn masses*—viz., one of our Lady, another of the Trinity, and the third of Requiem. The first in suits of white, the second in suits of blue, and the third in suits of black ; having at each mass three bishops come to execute, another to be gospeller, and another epistoler."

"The chief mourners there being placed within the hearse, Narroy, king of arms, *began the beads*. And at *the first mass*, the chief mourner, assisted with all the rest, *offered the mass penny*, and so returned to the hearse again, and placed them in the place aforesaid, conducted by the heralds and gentlemen ushers.

"The offering delivered to the chief mourners by the greatest person next him, being one of the mourners, and so in like manner to the mass of our Lady, sung and celebrated as aforesaid.

"These masses done and finished, began the mass of Requiem, and at the same time all the other mourners, next after the chief mourner, and after them every estate after their degree."

It ought further to reconcile the Church of Rome to Henry, to know that his will left the handsome bequest of £800, an immense sum in those days, to discharge the mass account.

Seventh Article of the Creed.

"Likewise I constantly hold that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer up prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration."

"Jehovah reigns, unbounded and alone,
And all creation hangs beneath His throne ;
He reigns alone, let no inferior nature,
Usurp or share the throne of the Creator."

The article quoted tells us that "the saints reigning with Christ" are to be honoured and invocated. The *present* reign of the saints with Christ in the kingdom of heaven is a figment, for which there is no scriptural warrant. We read that the saints shall reign with Christ, but that reign is yet future, and is to be on earth instead of in heaven :—

Rev. v. 10. "And (thou) hast made us unto our God kings and priests ; and *we shall reign on earth.*"

This is the only reign in which the saints shall participate with Christ. And hence the whole doctrine of Popish saint worship is based upon a gross misapprehension of Scripture teaching, with respect to the present and future condition of departed saints. It is not denied that the doctrine of a millennium future and its kingdom have their difficulties, and at present are but “seen through a glass darkly,” but Popery has misapplied and perverted what was before simply obscure.

As Rome’s doctrine of saint worship originates a variety of strange incongruities, and other matters not usually noticed in our controversial works, it may be useful to offer a few remarks here upon some unobserved discrepancies.

Of the four marks by which the Church of Rome claims to be a visible Church, one—and of course the chief one—is “sanctity.” By this term, however, the Church does not mean that she is a body of visible saints, or even that any individual of the body is so visibly sanctified as to be rightly considered or entitled a saint.

In the system of the Church of Rome, the term *Saint* is applied exclusively to a certain class of *deceased Christians*, whom the Pope, by a process or decision called canonisation, has certified to be in heaven. How a Church can be visibly holy without visible saints, is one of the difficulties involved in the doctrine of saint worship.

The Pope does not undertake to determine *all* the deceased members of the Church who are “reigning with Christ.” His plan is to make a selection of certain worthies about whom, according to his judgment, there can be no mistake, and having determined that these are certainly in the state of the blessed, he commands that these, and *these alone*, are to be “honoured and invocated,” or at least to be *publicly* worshipped.

A second anomaly in the doctrine or practice of saint worship, arises out of the historical fact that the process of Papal canonisation was not “developed” in the Church before the tenth century ; although the Church had been in the habit of honouring and invoking by name innumerable dead saints before that period. If canonisa-

tion is *now* deemed necessary to determine who among the dead are to be raised to the rank of acknowledged and accessible intercessors for the faithful, by what means was the Church guided to know who among the dead were reigning with Christ, and were eligible objects of "honour and invocation," before the process of canonisation was discovered or invented? The answer of course is, that any deceased martyr, confessor, or other person eminent for sanctity, having, according to the judgment of the contemporary Church, *merited* heaven, might be lawfully worshipped and invoked as a saint reigning with Christ, and that the names of such having come down by tradition, the Church of the present day has the guarantee furnished by this tradition, that such of these saints as she now worships may be safely resorted to, as reigning intercessors for the faithful.

The Saints reigning with Christ are thus theologically distinguished into two classes—the *traditional* and *canonical*, or canonised. Among the former are, as a matter of course, all the apostles and all the individuals, both men and women, to whom such reference is made, either by name or otherwise, in the New Testament, as leads to a belief that they lived and died believers in Christ. It has been remarked that among these, perhaps Peter's *wife* is the only individual particularised in the New Testament which the Church of Rome does not recognise as a New Testament saint and intercessor. Why the wife of Peter should be thus practically erased from the Romish calendar of the New Testament intercessors is not easily explained, except on the principle that a daily devotional reference and application to the spouse of Peter, "the first Pope," would necessarily carry with it the disagreeable suggestion that his "successors" have not succeeded him in the duties of a pious husband and father.

Saint worship is also remarkable for another omission in relation to the scriptural saints which Rome has selected and preserved in her devotional system. Tradition is indebted for many things to the Jewish Church, but it carefully rejects the worship of the *Jewish* saints. The very titles, St Abraham, St Isaac, St Jacob, St Moses, St

Isaiah, &c., would doubtless sound as strange and repulsive to a Roman Catholic ear as those of St Socrates, St Plato, or St Bonaparte. Why the Papacy has rejected from her recognised "saints reigning with Christ," such a number of holy men, some of whom were the most successful intercessors with God in the present life, is another of those anomalies in the system of her saint worship to which the Church has yet to give a satisfactory answer.

Among the saints reigning with Christ are to be included *angels* as well as men. In a controversial consideration of this Romish error, care should be taken to treat the two doctrines—that is, Angel Worship and Saint Worship—as distinct and separate tenets, as many arguments and Scripture passages which successfully refute one of these doctrines, are neither so pertinent or conclusive in the case of the other.

The article of the Creed distinguishes saint worship into two devotional exercises, "honour" and "invocation." To avoid the accusation of idolatry, the Church has devised the theory of two kinds of religious worship—*Latria*, the worship due to God; and *Dulia*, the worship due to the saints. However valid this distinction, the terms chosen to express it have been unfortunately selected and applied. Among the Greeks and Romans, who used these terms, *Latria* signified the homage and service due by a *freedman* to his master; *Dulia*, that due by a *slave* to his owner. Hence *Dulia* expressed a more profound homage or worship than *Latria*. According to the meaning of the terms, therefore, the devotees of the Papacy, instead of rendering a *less*, offer a *greater* homage to the saints than to God.

It is not necessary to enter into anything like an argument against a doctrine which has not a single Scripture precept, example, or permission for its support; while the whole tenor and teaching of the sacred page is fraught with arguments against it. These will be found in the numerous able treatises which have been written to expose the error. A few considerations which perhaps will not be met with in many, if in any of those works, are subjoined.

One of the most essential qualifications of an intercessor is that he should *understand* our wants. And the nature of human wants is such that nothing short of *actual experience* can supply this understanding. This is plainly evinced even in relation to Christ himself :—

Heb. ii. 17. “Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people; for that *he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.*”

The plain inference from this and similar passages is, that it was only by a personal experience of man's condition and wants that even Christ himself could be duly qualified to understand and appreciate and intercede for human necessities. Another qualification necessary to the legitimate intercessor is the possession of *office*, with divine appointments, both as regards *time* and *place*, for the exercise of this office. Thus all the Old Testament priests were official intercessors, but none could exercise his intercessory office when or where the *high* priest was the officiating mediator. This was conspicuously exemplified on the great day of atonement, when none but the high priest could enter the holy of holies. The typology here clearly teaches that Christ—“the minister of the true tabernacle which the Lord hath pitched, and not man”—having entered upon his office in glory, none but *this* intercessor can plead the cause of His people in the holy of holies of the celestial sanctuary; as it is written—

Heb. ix. 24. “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.”

We have thus two essential qualifications necessary to every effective mediator with God—one *personal*, the other *official*; one acquired by the experience of human infirmities and human sufferings, the other acquired by a divine appointment to office, including the time, place, and manner of its exercise. The argument which may be derived from the preceding principles smites the whole of Rome's twofold intercessory system, or the intercessional office

of saints and angels. For, first, angels can be no intercessors, for the simple reason that they have never been made *experimentally acquainted* with our condition and wants, and therefore can never adequately understand our case, much less possess the sympathy which the Scriptures represent as necessary to the intercessory office. It was because, and only because, Christ "was tempted in all points like as we are," that He "can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities," Heb. iv. 15.

Again, saints who have passed into glory can be no intercessors, because although made experimentally acquainted with the wants of their brethren on earth, they have there no *intercessory office*. They are just in the same ex-official position as the subordinate priests of the Jewish economy were when the high priest went to officiate in the earthly tabernacle. As when the Jewish high priest "appeared in the presence of God" for the literal Israel, no subordinate priest could officiate with him, so when the Christian high priest appears in the presence of God for the spiritual Israel, no subordinate priest of his order (an order to which every true Christian belongs) can officiate in the same presence for the same object without usurping the Saviour's office, and casting an imputation on the sufficiency and efficacy of His intercessory functions.

Development of Saint Worship.

The worship of *angels* commenced early in the Church, from a mistaken application of certain Scripture passages which were supposed to give countenance to the practice. Angels are said to be "ministering spirits sent forth to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation." Taking this word angel, which simply signifies a *messenger*, (and therefore designates an *office*, and not a *nature*,) to mean the order of heavenly spirits which kept their first estate, the Church early came to regard such spirits not merely as *messengers* and *servants* to the elect, but as including in their commission the function of intercession—a function at all times scripturally confined to the office of *priesthood*. Thus, as in other cases, this error arose simply from "not

knowing the Scriptures." The apostle's warning being either unknown or unheeded, the Church early fell into the practice of "a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels," Col. ii. 18.

To the worship of angels succeeded the worship of saints. That the Church began very early to pray *for* the dead is as early attested, and the error is easily traceable to that laudable affection which men bear to their kindred and friends. This affection follows them beyond the grave, and in the absence of a clear understanding respecting the condition of the soul in what is termed "the intermediate state," (or the state of the soul between death and the resurrection,) nothing was more *natural*, but at the same time more unscriptural, than that the survivors of relatives and friends should seek to benefit them beyond the grave. Hence, the dead in the first stage of the error under notice, were exclusively the *subjects* of prayer, instead of being, as now, the *objects* of prayer.

But of those who pass out of this world, some give such evidence that they have died in the full assurance of faith, as to leave survivors satisfied that they have passed to the mansions of light, and *do not need our prayers*. But if we cannot benefit them, may not they benefit us? In the absence of Scripture light, this question early received an affirmative answer, and prayers *for* the dead were speedily followed by prayers *to* the dead.

A third and still more anti-scriptural corruption speedily followed—namely, prayer *through* the saints. That is, prayer not offered up to the saint as an intercessor with God, but prayer offered to God, with an application for a favourable answer on the ground of some saint's *merits*. Take an example, among several, from the Roman Catholic prayer-book, called the *Missal for the Laity* :—

PRAYER "THROUGH" THE MERITS OF ST JOSEPH FOR 19TH MARCH.*

"Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord, that we may be assisted by the *merits* of the spouse of thy most Holy Virgin Mother, and that what we cannot obtain through our own weakness, may be granted to us by his prayers."

As prayers thus grounded on the "merits" of the saints

not only depreciates the intercessory, but the very sacrificial office, or satisfaction, of Christ, this form of saint worship embraces the highest and most profane disparagement of Christ's mediatorial work.

Those who first came to be regarded as possessed of sufficient *merit* to constitute them successful intercessors in heaven were the martyrs, then eminent confessors, and afterwards any individual conspicuous for ascetic habits. Such was the style of *post-mortem* saints worshipped by the Church until the

Development of Canonisation.

This formed a special epoch in the progress of saint worship. However, instead of being an institution intended to *forward*, it was one designed to *restrain* the progress of saint worship.

As at first every local church, or rather every individual, had a *carte blanche* or a free licence to worship what saints they or he pleased, it followed that the saints became almost as numerous as the sinners who sought their aid, and what was worse, it appears that many popularly invested with the character of saints were so little entitled to the character, that perhaps no community so early came to embrace a larger number of members deserving of transportation than the confraternity of Romish saints.

The following is Mosheim's account of the state of matters in the ninth century:—

“How great were the ignorance and perverseness of this century, appears from the single fact of the extravagant and stupid veneration *paid to saints, and to their bones and carcases*; for in this consisted the greatest part of piety and religion. All believed that they should never find God propitious to them unless they obtained some intercessor and patron among the glorified saints; and each separate church, and almost each individual, sought for some particular and appropriate patron, *as if afraid that a patron engaged to manage the concerns of others would neglect them if committed to him.* . . .

“Hence arose the rage for creating almost daily new tutelar deities. And the priests and monks were most successful in dispelling the darkness which concealed the wondrous deeds of many holy men, or rather in *fabricating the names and histories of saints who never*

existed, so that they might have patrons enough for all the credulous and senseless people. Many, however, provided for themselves by committing their interest and their salvation to phantoms of their own creation, or to morally delirious persons, who, as they supposed, had led very holy lives, because they had lived like fools and madmen."—Century 9, part 2, chap. 3.

To keep down the growth of this rabble of saints, and to create an aristocracy in heaven, which could be confidently resorted to by their earthly clients, the Pope fell upon the scheme of canonisation. It cannot, however, be called an invention of the Church. The genius of Popery is not fertile; it possesses the power to appropriate, but little or none to originate. It is essentially a *mimic* system. Thus canonisation was simply an appropriation and mimicry of the heathen process of apotheosis or deification. If heroes famous for natural courage and exploits were deified or demi-deified by their pagan admirers, why should not the moral heroes and miracle-workers of the Christian Church be similarly enrolled among the inhabitants of heaven, and by a similar authoritative process? The process, however, like every other development, was gradual. To popular canonisation succeeded Episcopal, and to Episcopal, Papal.

"To the licentiousness of multiplying daily the number of the saints, or ministers at the celestial court, which ill-informed men pictured to themselves, the ecclesiastical councils endeavoured to set bounds; for they ordained that no person should be accounted a glorified saint unless *he was declared worthy of that honour by the bishop and provincial council in presence of the people.* . . .

"There were also some in this age who deemed it not absolutely necessary, though useful and proper, that the decisions of bishops and councils should be sanctioned and confirmed by the approbation of the supreme head of the Church, that is, by the Bishop of Rome. Nor will this excite surprise if we consider the great increase of the Papal power in that unenlightened, rude, and superstitious age. There is indeed no example to be met with prior to the *tenth century* of any one being solemnly enrolled among the saints by the Romish bishop; yet that he was sometimes consulted on such matters, and his opinion asked respecting those to be consecrated, may be shown by some testimonies. In *this gradual manner it was that the practice of canonisation or creation of saints arrived at maturity in the Church.*"—*Ibid.*

To these statements of Mosheim, his editor Murdoch subjoins a note, from which the following is an extract:—

“The earliest solemn canonisation by the popes of which we have authentic records is that of Ulrick (sometimes written Udalrick), Bishop of Augsburg, by John XV., A.D. 995. Yet bishops, metropolitans, and provincial councils, were concerned in such acts for more than a century after this. And it was not until the pontificate of Alexander III., A.D. 1160–1181, that the popes claimed the *exclusive power* of adding new saints to the calendar.”—*Ibid.*

Cardinal Wiseman, in his *Lives of Five Saints* (Dolman, London, 1846), supplies particulars concerning the process of modern canonisation which are worthy of being noted. His opening remarks corroborate those just quoted from Mosheim:—

“Each bishop (he says) formerly possessed the right of decreeing the *beatification*, so to speak, of a confessor, which became a *canonisation* when adopted by the rest of the Church, with the consent, tacit or expressed, by the Pope. *At last* Alexander III. reserved this right to the Holy See, by whom alone it has ever since been exercised.”

The Cardinal subjoins a note to the effect that the chief difference between beatification and canonisation was, that beatification created merely a *local* saint, or a saint for a city or province, while canonisation created and creates a catholic or universal saint, one who may take the affairs of the world under his auspices in the state of glory!

“In 1587 Sextus V. established the Congregation of Rites ordaining that, in addition to other duties, it should take cognisation of all causes respecting *canonisation*. . . .

“The Congregation consists of a cardinal-prefect and a body of cardinals, who undertake the office of Reporters of the cause to the Congregation; a Prothonotary, Secretary, the Promoter and Sub-promoter of the Faith, Consultors, Auditors of the Rota, Advocates, Physicians, Surgeons, an Archivist and Interpreters of the Processes.”

Of these offices, the Promoter of the Faith is one of the most important in the “processes” of canonisation, the first part of which takes the form of a forensic trial. He is called, in the slang of the processes, the “Devil’s Advocate,” as his office is to test, and, if possible, to *disprove*

the testimony brought forward in support of the deserts of the saints proposed for canonisation.

"It is said that the ingenuity and eloquence of the Devil's Advocate nearly prevented the canonisation of Cardinal Borromeo in the seventeenth century."—Eadie's *Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia*, p. 121.

It is remarkable that, however *near* being successful, the "Devil's Advocate" never *has* succeeded in overturning the evidence produced for the merits and miracles which are necessary to be established in behalf of the candidate for saintship.

The Cardinal having supplied the list of officials, next proceeds to detail the processes of canonisation. A few excerpts are subjoined, as affording interesting information on one of the most extraordinary "developments" in the system of Popery.

"Causes of Beatification and Canonisation regard either *Martyrs* or *Confessors*.

"The Holy See never receives or entertains any cause, unless it can first be proved (by those who seek for the canonisation of the deceased candidate for saintship) that the subject of it enjoys a reputation for *sanctity* and *miracles*."

Those who thus initiate the movement, or seek for a canonisation, are called the *Postulators of the Cause*; and their movement in each case begins this way:—

"The ordinary or bishop of the diocese from which the cause is brought to Rome, draws up, in virtue of his own authority, two processes, in which he pronounces that the deceased servant of God enjoys this reputation, and that the decrees of Urban VIII., forbidding public honours to be given without leave from the Holy See, have been complied with."

"The Congregation of Rites proceeds to examine the virtues and miracles in detail, provided that *fifty years have elapsed since the death of the servant of God*."

Why a half-century should pass, in this case, before the miracles of the about-to-be-canonised can be examined, is a very singular rule. One would think that the *sooner* the evidence for any alleged miraculous power was tested the better for the interest of truth. If the Devil's Advocate, or the so-called "Promoter of the Faith," were not

a mere sham functionary serving the interest of falsehood, could he not at any time find in this one fact, sufficient *prima facie* or presumptive evidence that the Pope devised this rule to *hinder the discovery of falsehood*, instead of promoting the interest of the faith? Can there be a doubt that the "Devil's Advocate" is literally what his appropriate title implies?—that, instead of being a promoter of the faith, his office and advocacy have been devised to cover one of the most infamous pieces of barefaced imposture supplied even by the history of the Papacy. The Cardinal goes on to say:—

"The examination is proposed in the form of a doubt whether the servant of God possessed the theological and cardinal virtues in an heroic degree.

"The miracles reported to have been performed through the intercession of the servant of God are next examined in three Congregations.

"At every stage the Promoter of the Faith (the Devil's Advocate) must be consulted, and it is his duty to bring forward every objection that he thinks fit *against* the proofs of the virtues and miracles of the servant of God.

"His arguments are stated in writing, and the advocates employed in the cause (on the side of the Postulators) prepare their reply.

"When all the doubts have been satisfactorily removed, the Pope appoints a day for the solemn beatification of the servant of God, who then receives the title of Beatus or blessed.

"The day for the solemn canonisation is announced, which we shall now proceed to describe."

The Cardinal's description of this piece of farcical Popery is too long to be inserted. But as the subject is one of the most characteristic of Popery, several more extracts are subjoined.

"The day having been fixed for the ceremony, an edict is published, declaring it for that year a holiday of obligation.

"When the day arrives, a solemn procession of all the secular and regular clergy of Rome, differing in a few respects from that of *Corpus Christi*, goes from the Vatican palace round the colonade to the principal door of St Peter's. Lighted tapers are borne by all, and the *standards of the new saints* are carried.

"The procession then advances in the following order.

The Cardinal having described the order proceeds :—

“On arriving at the altar of the blessed sacrament, the Pope descends from his chair and kneels for a short space in adoration, and then re-ascending, the chair is borne to the throne, where he receives the customary homage of the cardinal-bishops and others. All being at length arranged in their places, a master of ceremonies conducts to the throne (of the Pope) the cardinal-procurator, attended on his left by a consistorial advocate, who on *his knees* thus prays his Holiness, in the name of the said cardinal, to admit the subjects who are to be canonised into the catalogue of the saints :—

“The Most Reverend Cardinal N., here present, earnestly petitions your Holiness to enrol among Christ’s saints, &c.

“The Secretary of the Briefs replies on the part of his Holiness.

“The cardinal-procurator returns, and the consistorial advocate repeats the petition in the following manner :—

“The Most Reverend Cardinal N. earnestly and *more* earnestly petitions his Holiness, &c.

“The prayer is then sung by the Pope, who afterwards ascends his throne, and for the *third* time the cardinal-procurator returns, and the consistorial advocate repeats the request in *still stronger* terms :—

“Holy Father, the Most Reverend Cardinal N., *earnestly, more* earnestly, and *most* earnestly petitions, &c.

“The Secretary now replies that his Holiness, being satisfied that God approves the request, has at length resolved to pronounce the definite sentence, which, by virtue of the supreme power given him, he does in the following manner :—

“To the Honour of the holy and undivided Trinity, the exaltation of the Catholic faith, and increase of Christianity—by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, *and our own*, after a mature deliberation, repeated invocation of the Divine succour, and the counsel of our venerable brethren, the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, the Patriarchs and the Archbishops dwelling in the city, we declare thee, blessed N. N., *to be saints, and enrol them in the catalogue of saints*, enjoining the universal church devoutly to worship their memory yearly upon their natal day. Amen.

“At the same moment the sound of trumpets and bells of the Basilica announce the joyous intelligence to the city, which is echoed and re-echoed by the sounds of drums, *the thunders of artillery from the castle*, and the pealing of the bells of the Capitol, and of every church in Rome, which continue ringing for the space of an hour.

“The last peculiar circumstance consists in the oblation made at

the offertory or immediately after the canonisation, if the Pope should not celebrate high mass. . . .

"The offerings, which are presented with great solemnity and ceremony, are as follows for each saint:—

"*Two large wax candles of forty-five pounds weight each, beautifully decorated with effigies of the saint*, are carried by two attendants of the cardinal-bishop, who follows them.

"*A smaller taper and a cage containing two pigeons*, borne by the postulator of the cause and another member of the order to which the saint belonged, or of the community which has moved the cause.

"*Two loaves, one gilded, the other silvered with the armorial bearings of the Pontiff represented upon them*, and carried upon two dishes of wood silvered.

"*Another small taper and a cage containing two turtle doves*, carried by the cardinal-priest and two other religious or seculars, according to the order to which the saint belonged.

"The cardinal-deacon succeeds—*two barrels of wine, one gilded, the other silvered*, being carried before him.

"Lastly, two other religious or seculars *with a taper and a cage containing divers kinds of birds*.

"The cardinal-bishop presents the large tapers; the cardinal-procurator the smaller ones; the cardinal-priest the bread; the cardinal-deacon the wine; and finally, the cardinal-procurator the different kinds of birds, each kissing the hand of the Pope.

"At the conclusion, the Pontiff sits in his chair of state with his tiara on his head, and receives from the cardinal-arch-priest of the Basilica a purse embroidered with gold containing twenty-five crowns—such being the custom whenever the Pope sings mass."

The Cardinal closes his account of this piece of extraordinary ceremonial mummary with an explanation of the mysteries symbolised by the various articles of the "offering." The manufacture of a saint after this fashion is a formidable matter on the score of finance; the price demanded by the Pope or his officials being about £10,000. Those who wish to see this fact interestingly verified may consult Sir Culling Eardley Smyth's *Correspondence with the Catholic Institute of England*: London, 1845. The Catholic Institute did not deny that the canonisation of Maria Francesca in 1839, the case in question, cost the alleged sum to the postulators of Naples, but defended the expense on the ground that it was necessary to employ so many officials as a "preservative against deception." According to Sir Culling's view of the matter, the expenses

thus incurred were to *produce* instead of prevent deception. And the whole process of canonisation significantly testifies to this truth.

As before noticed, the great qualification necessary to the acquisition of saintship is the power of working miracles, always at least "fifty years" before inquiry into their performance commences. Like Maria Francesca, the most distinguished miracle-workers of Popery have been sainted *women*. Now it appears rather extraordinary, that while Popery abounds with female miraculists, the Scriptures, so far as ordinary readers can ascertain, furnish no instance of a miracle wrought by a female.

Thus the process of this development having commenced in the Church by changing the signification of the term saint, the Pope has come to charge £10,000 for conferring the title saint in the new sense which he affixes to the term, and which has laid the foundation of all that gigantic performance and pious fraud which now bears the name of *Canonisation*.

Social and Political Influences of the Dogma.

Every variety of false worship must, at least indirectly, entail corresponding social and political evils. But besides the indirect and pernicious influence which thus affects society through the doctrine and practice of creature idolatry, saint and angel worship embrace many practical and direct violations of social obligations and civil interest. The number of *saint days*, of festivals, fasts, and other memorial seasons set apart by the Papacy for the public worship of its idols, have had, and still have, notwithstanding the great curtailment which the Papacy has been obliged to make in its festival observances, some of the most deleterious effects upon the moral and social prosperity of society. Most of these festivals are what the Church denominates "holy days of obligation," that is, days in which the Romish worshipper is both obliged to attend on the public religious services of the Church, and to abstain from "servile work" or from secular duties. It is a common notion entertained by the shallow smatterers

who seek to characterise all attempts to resist the corruptions of the Papacy as religious persecution, that any attempt to restrain what *they* call the Pope's spiritual power in this country is an act of intolerance. Now, if anything may be viewed as a purely spiritual department of Popery, this of saint worship must be regarded as such. Yet, allow the Pope to possess all the liberty he may claim to exercise in connection with this worship, and he can multiply holidays, and has multiplied them, to such an extent as to *reduce the subjects of any sovereign to a nation of idlers and beggars*. The very word *idlers*, which has just dropt from the pen, has evidently its remote derivation from the same source as the term *idolater*, and would hence imply that all *idolatrous* worship is *idle* worship, or worship which creates or produces idleness. Hence the creation of Popish holidays is simply the creation of idlers, and the creation of idlers is the creation of paupers and profligates. Even in the days of Cyril of Alexandria it was found that saint days, so far from being productive of holiness, were fruitful of profligacy; and it is remarkable that, while the complaint of Cyril bears this testimony, the evil fruits of the tree by no means convinced him that the tree itself was bad. That is, he by no means condemns the saint-day worship, although he had to confess it produced only saint-day idleness, debauchery, and crime :—

“Alas, (he says,) very many of us Christians imitate the madness and intemperance of the Jews, who, upon holidays and solemn festivals, giving themselves over to scandalous plays, to drunkenness, to dancing, or other vanities of the world, when they ought to serve God more diligently, to frequent the churches more earnestly, to be instant in prayers, and be engaged in ecclesiastical duties, *do then most of all* provoke God with their most dissolute manners. . . .

“If *work be prohibited on holidays*, which must be used for the necessary sustenance of life, are not those things then much more forbidden which cannot be committed without sin and great offence to God?”

Again, mark the singular confession contained in the following :—

“On days that are allowed for servile work every one *is intent*

upon his business, and he abstains from drunkenness, pastimes, and vanities ; but on holidays men everywhere run to the ale-house, to plays, to interludes and dances, to the derision of God's name, and the perversion of His day."

Not of *His* day, for He never made but one day holy—"and the Lord rested on the seventh day, and *sanctified* it," or made it holy. When men make holy days they may always expect that the *work will be like the workmen* ; and from the days of Cyril to the present, every day for which there has not been a clear "thus saith the Lord," will be found to produce unholy instead of holy fruits.

The ecclesiastical legislation of the Papacy has been scientifically digested in the Canon Law. No pains have been spared to reduce this celebrated code to perspicuous and convenient order, and yet there is one principle of analysis and arrangement which would have been worth the whole of Gratian's improvements had he been guided to adopt it. According to this arrangement, the whole ecclesiastical legislation of the Papacy would appear under two heads—one containing those enactments by which the Papacy *created its system of errors*, and the other, a much more numerous body of statutes, which it had to employ in order to *correct the evils flowing from the first*. In the former of these divisions would be included all those festival institutions to which Cyril refers ; and, in the second, all those enactments which, shortly after the days of Cyril, the Church had to frame in order to reform the evil of which Cyril complains.

It is, however, more easy to create than to correct evils ; and hence, notwithstanding the many laws which the councils of Africa and other councils enacted against the abuses of which Cyril complains, the holy-days of the Papacy have continued to create the most unholy results.

But it is not merely the moral, but the civil and political interests of society, that are radically and perniciously affected by the associations of Popish saint worship. Political economy, or the science which elaborates the principles that increase the resources and wealth of a nation,

exhibits the evils of all unnecessary reduction of the national industry :—

“The Sabbath, considering it only under a political point of view, is an admirable institution. It was proper to give a stated day of rest to mankind, that they might have time to recover themselves, and to lift up their eyes to heaven. . . .

“But by *multiplying days of inactivity*, hath not that which was established for the advantage of individuals and societies been converted into a calamity for them? Would not a soil which should be ploughed three hundred days in the year by strong and vigorous animals yield double the produce of that which could only be worked one hundred and fifty days in the year? What strange infatuation! Torrents of blood have been shed, an infinite number of times, to prevent the dismembering of a territory, or to increase its extent; and yet the powers entrusted with the maintenance of happiness have patiently suffered that a priest, sometimes even a foreign priest, *should invade successfully one-third of this territory by the proportional diminution of labour, which alone could fertilise it!*

“The effect of saint days on Spain may serve as a specimen of their effect on the other Popish countries. It is stated, by a noble writer of her own, that *the sum lost to Spain every feast day by the suspension of labour in trade, manufactures, and agriculture, amounts to four million of livres*. At this rate, supposing the livre to be worth of our money tenpence sterling, and supposing the number of festivals on which labour is entirely suspended to be no more than forty—a number, there is reason to believe, much below the truth—the annual deficiency to Spain, in point of wealth, would amount to almost *seven million sterling!*”—See *Rev. Wm. M'Kray's Essay on the Reformation*, p. 156.

In conclusion, on the subject of saint worship it cannot be shown that the worship of *dead* saints is a whit more scriptural than the worship of *living* ones. Christ himself is not more worthy of worship now than when He walked the streets of Jerusalem. If the Apostle Peter is to be worshipped now, then he should have been worshipped on earth; but mark how he rejects this idolatry—

Acts x. 25, 26, “And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up: I myself also am a man.”

If the worship here offered to Peter was “*Latria*,” then, according to the Church of Rome, Cornelius would have been an idolator, while the Scriptures represent him as a

devout and accepted worshipper of the true God. Again, if the worship here offered to Peter was the “*dulia*,” which Rome says is lawful to be given to the saints, then why did St Peter refuse it? History corroborates Scripture in proving that the early Church knew nothing about the worship of “saints departed.” The only dead man worshipped before the fourth century of the Church was “the man Christ Jesus!”

Relics of the Saints.

The seventh article of the creed includes in the worship of the saints the worship of their “relics.” By a relic the Church of Rome means any part of a deceased saint’s body or chattels, as a tooth or a toe-nail, a rag of his dress, a button, a buckle, a night-cap, &c.

The *principle*, or that which authorises the doctrine and practice of relic worship, is that the relic participates in the same holiness, the same miraculous power, and the same intercessory influence with God, as the saint to which the relic belonged. Hence it is to be worshipped with the same worship, to be resorted to for the same miraculous benefits, and to be made a similar ground or plea to induce God to bestow those benefits on the worshipper. The words of the Council of Trent on relics are subjoined, to verify these representations:—

“*Through them (bodies of the saints) many benefits are bestowed by God on men, so that they who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to relics, or that these and other sacred monuments are uselessly honoured by the faithful, and that places dedicated to the memories of the saints are in vain visited with a view of obtaining their aid, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has long since condemned, and now also condemns.*”—*Sess. 25, Waterworth, p. 234.*

The Council is not explicit as to this species of worship,—it does not say how the worshipper is to behave himself in the presence of a relic,—whether the relic is to be “invoked” like the saint himself, &c. But the *practice* of the Church leaves little doubt that the doctrine of relic worship is in every respect identical with the doctrine of saint worship, except that the “veneration” is addressed

to some detached fragment of his person or property instead of the saint himself. There is, of course, no occasion whatever to resort to either Scripture or argument for the purpose of refuting this unscriptural, unreasonable, and even disgusting tenet. Yet Roman Catholics have sometimes attempted to "wrest the Scriptures" in support of this most loathsome and contemptible form of idolatry. One would have supposed that the significant teaching to be derived from the Divine disposal of the body of Moses would have supplied a sufficient lesson to the most stupid on this subject, as commentators are about unanimously agreed that the body of Moses was so carefully secreted from the Jews for the sole purpose of preventing the Jews from defiling themselves with the worship of his "relics."

But the Romish polemic says, "If the bones of Moses were hid those of Elisha were exposed, and when touched by a dead man's body restored the body to life, (2 Kings xiii. 21.)

As this is perhaps the only semblance of an argument which Rome has to produce in favour of relic worship, it may receive a passing notice. It is true the bones of Elisha were not buried, or hidden beneath the earth, like the remains of the dead in modern times.

His bones were placed in an over-ground sepulchral chamber, accessible to the living. But this was the custom with the *Jews in general*, so that if the prophet's bones were exposed or accessible for veneration, those of every other Jew, including sinners as well as saints, would have been similarly designed for veneration. As to the miraculous incident in the case, which Romish superstition has seized with so much avidity to support the idea of the inherent miraculous virtue of "holy bones" in general, this, so far from proving in favour of relic worship, very strongly proves the reverse. For if the individual whose body received life from the incidental contact with the bones of Elisha worshipped the relics of the prophet for the benefit received, the Holy Spirit could only have denied this devotion a record in order to express his disapproval of the act, and prevent our being corrupted by the example.

The fact is, the Jews and other Eastern nations regarded it as profanation of the dead to disturb their entombed remains. The Romish practice of disinterring these remains, and hawking about the bones of departed Christians for show, for traffic, and other superstitious purposes, instead of being an act of veneration to the departed, is a profane abuse of the dead, demanding even magisterial interference and suppression.

Development of Relic Worship.

The references to the Jewish Scriptures and people which have just been made, sufficiently assure us that Rome did not borrow the doctrine or practice of relic worship from the Jews, who, with all their idolatry, do not appear to have ever conceived the idea of worshipping the bones or other preserved morsels of dead men.

Equally certain is it that the enlightened heathen never descended so low in the scale of superstitious homage as to render worship to the relics of their departed heroes. So far from being given to the practice of preserving any of the bodily constituents of the dead, the heathens thought they honoured their dead more by giving their remains to the funeral pile, and afterwards depositing the ashes in the sepulchral urn.

Hence relic worship, unlike other departments of Popery, cannot be palliated by referring it to the influence of a prior example, to be found in the Jewish or heathen systems. Relic idolatry is a pure development of Popery, and springs from that insatiable appetite for creature worship which characterises Romanism. Nevertheless, as in other developments, the mental propensity has not been called into exercise without circumstantial causes. The first of these causes had reference to an amiable and commendable sentiment. The love which early Christians bore to each other caused the deepest interest of the living in the remains of the departed, and especially those who had suffered as martyrs :—

“ It has been justly said that the blood of the martyrs was the glory and seed of the Church, because the constancy of her con-

fessors has perhaps given her more converts than the eloquence and learning of her doctors. It was therefore very natural that the memory of those noble champions of Christianity should be held in great veneration by their brethren in the faith. The *bodies of their martyrs, or their remnants, were always, when it was possible, purchased from their judges or executioners, and decently buried by the Christians.*"—Calvin's *Treatise on Relics*, p. 3. Edinburgh, 1854.

This laudable procedure, in which surviving Christians showed their love and esteem for departed brethren, by *burying* their bodily members or relics, became the innocent occasion of the subsequent abuse of relic worship. True veneration for the deceased members of the Church soon developed into pure superstition, and instead of honouring the deceased by a comely interment of their remains, the Papacy inaugurated the most disgusting practice of preserving the bones and other parts of the dead martyrs, confessors, &c., to feed the idolatrous appetite which so speedily sprung up in the early Church.

In the African or Egyptian Churches, as might be expected from the antecedents of Egypt, the Christians in the fourth and fifth century began to show their respect for deceased saints, by embalming and preserving them in their houses. See Gieseler's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i., p. 283.

About the same time sprang up the practice of depositing the bones of martyrs beneath the altars of newly-erected churches. St Ambrose, in the year 386, having to consecrate a church in the city of Milan, was prevented for want of relics. These, however, according to the story, were fortunately procured, in consequence of a dream which revealed to Ambrose where to find the bodies or bones of Sts Gervasius and Protatius. Having secured these treasures, Ambrose immediately had them transferred to the altar place of the intended church, which he was then enabled to consecrate with the due canonical requirements of the time.—Fleury, book xviii., chap. 46.

The superstition which required church altars to be made a sepulchral depository for relics, is forcibly illustrated by the singular letter of Gregory I. (sixth century) to the

Empress Constantina, in reply to one which the empress had written to Gregory for some relics of St Paul, which she wished to enshrine in a new church she was about to build, and to dedicate to that apostle. Gregory refused to part with any of the body of the apostle, and for reasons which supply valuable historical evidence of the state of the Church, in relation to this question, at the close of the sixth century :—

“Great sadness hath possessed me because you have enjoined on me those things which I neither can nor dare do ; for the bodies of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, are so resplendent with miracles and terrific prodigies in their own churches, that no one can approach them without great awe even for the purpose of *adoring* them. When my predecessor, of happy memory, wished to change some silver ornament which was placed over the most holy body of St Peter, though at the distance of almost fifteen feet, a warning of no small terror appeared to him. Even I myself wished to make some alteration near the most holy body of St Paul, and it was necessary to dig rather deeply near his tomb. The superior of the place found some bones which were not at all connected with that tomb ; and having presumed to disturb and remove them to some other place, he was visited by certain fearful apparitions, and died suddenly. My predecessor, of holy memory, also undertook to make some repairs near the tomb of St Laurence. As they were digging, without knowing precisely where the venerable body was placed, they happened to open his sepulchre. The monks and guardians who were at the work, *only because they had seen the body of that martyr*, without presuming so much as to touch it, *all died within ten days*, to the end that no man might remain in life who had beheld the body of that just man !” (How different such results from the benign influence which emanated from the relics or bones of Elisha, which, instead of destroying, restored life to the man who touched them !)—*Gieseler*, vol. i. p. 350.

Gregory having thus apologised for not complying with the request of the empress to send some of the relics of Paul from Rome to Constantinople, was mindful to meet the wishes of the empress as far as he could, and to that end postscribes his letter with the following boon :—

“But that your religious desire may not be wholly frustrated, I will hasten to send to you some part of those chains which St Paul wore on his neck and hands, if indeed I shall succeed in getting off any filings from them. For since many continually solicit as a blessing that they may carry off from those chains some small por-

tion of their filings, *a priest stands by with a file*; and sometimes it happens that some portions fall off from the chain instantly, and without delay; while, at other times, the file is long drawn over the chains, and yet nothing is at last scraped off from them!"—Quoted in Gieseler, vol. i. p. 350, note 5.

After Gregory's day relics became famous not for *killing* people even for venturing to look at them, but, according to the declaration of the Council of Trent, for *curing* them. This was a great change for the better, and the priests turned it to the best advantage, by everywhere providing their flocks with an abundant supply of these remedial charms. So long as relics could only be approached with such awful results as those related by Gregory, the less the world had to do with such dangerous articles the better; but when relics became propitious and beneficent, their multiplication of course became a proportional benefit to "the faithful." Accordingly, from the time this happy change came over their character, relics came to be discovered, and even *manufactured*, in such profusion, that, if St Ambrose had lived in later times, instead of the bones of two saints acquired with great difficulty, he could have procured the bones of as many thousand with no difficulty at all. The wood of the true cross was multiplied at such a rate that, it has been alleged, the different chapels of Europe contained as much of that article as would supply a small town with a winter's firewood. One would think that so much absurdity would bring conviction even to a Romanist. No such thing. As in the case of Transubstantiation, the faith of a Romanist is always increased by difficulties, and he embraces a doctrine the firmer because it is absurd or impossible. To account for the multiplication of the wood of the cross, an eminent bishop has said, that, "to reward the zeal [of pilgrims (who repaired to visit the specimens of this relic deposited in various chapels) the cross was made to *vegetate and grow*, so that the faithful might be spiritually fed, as the multitude were corporeally replenished by the miracle of the loaves and fishes." On the same principle, when it was shown that as many as five arms belonging to the same saint, and

several heads belonging to another, were to be found in different chapels, the phenomena, instead of being regarded as an obstacle to the faith of the relic-worshipper, was adduced as a proof of the genuineness of the original article!

Under the encouragement of such a confiding belief, the relic system progressed apace, "pious fraud" prospered on yet more pious credulity, and, according to the historian, the religion of relics became nearly the whole religion of Christendom about the ninth century.

"In the bones of those who were accounted saints, and the utensils which they used when alive, and even in the very ground which they had touched, there was supposed to reside a marvellous power of repelling all evils, both bodily and mental, and especially of paralyzing the machinations of the prince of darkness. Hence scarcely any one was willing to be destitute of these useful safeguards. The eagerness for relics led some to encounter severe toil and troublesome journeys, while it prompted others to delude the wretched people with base impositions. To obtain a sufficiency of relics for those who were desirous of them, the latent carcasses of departed saints were first sought for by the priests with prayer and fasting, and then were discovered by the guidance and monitions of God. The exultation on the discovery of such a treasure was immense. Some made journeys into the East, and travelled over the regions and places made famous by the presence of Christ and His friends, in order to bring from them what would afford comfort to the faint-hearted, and protection to their country and their fellow-citizens. Nor did such travellers return empty; for the cunning Greeks, always versatile and knavish, took from the honest Latins their genuine coin, and sent them home loaded with spurious merchandise. In this way the numerous holy bodies and parts of bodies—of Mark, James, Bartholomew, Cyprian, Nantaleon, and others, in which the West still exults—were introduced among the Latins. Those who were unable to procure these precious treasures by either journeys, prayers, or frauds, deemed it expedient to steal them, or to seize them by violence and robbery; for whatever means were resorted to in such a cause as this were supposed to be pious and acceptable, provided only they were successful."—Mosheim, century 9, p. 307. Ed. 1861.

Every one acquainted with Mosheim knows that his notes supply the necessary credible authorities for every assertion he makes, else one would feel disposed to believe that some of the above statements were at least coloured representations. The fact is, that we cannot caricature Popery—that, instead of overdrawing, no historical picture

can adequately represent the foul and fraudulent traits of the apostasy.

According to the extract from Mosheim, most of the transactions which concerned the early Church having occurred in the East, the Eastern Church became the great emporium to the West for the merchandise of relics. The frauds committed by the relic merchants of the East receives illustration in such cases as the following :—

“ In this town (Geneva) there was formerly, it is said, an arm of St Anthony. It was kissed and worshipped as long as it remained in its shrine ; but when it was turned out and examined, it was found to be the *bone of a stag* !

“ There was in the high altar the brain of St Peter. So long as it rested in its shrine nobody ever doubted its genuineness, for it would have been blasphemy to do so ; but when it was subjected to close inspection, it proved to be a piece of *pumice stone*.”—Calvin's *Treatise on Relics*, p. 224.

Doubtless we have here a key to unlock the meaning of those tales respecting the danger of *looking* at, much more touching, the relics, of which the chapels became the custodians from the days of Gregory I. Relics, like doctrines, need to be carefully preserved from the scrutiny of private judgment. The Pope, like a trader in pinchbeck instead of gold, is always fearful of subjecting his wares to the test of examination. The Church is a meretricious lady who paints ; and hence she always becomes alarmed lest a too near approach should reveal the fictitious character of her beauty. Not till the rude and testing touch of the Reformers had brushed off some of the pigment from the lady's face, was the world released from the superstitious fears which prevented the public from discovering the priestly impostures associated with the doctrine and practice of relic-worship. Not till then were the rulers of the Papacy compelled, in self-defence, to take some steps to restrain the abuses of relic-worship. The steps so taken ultimately led to the creation by the Pope of the Roman committee or corporation, called

The Congregation of Relics.

This Congregation professedly sits in Rome to investigate all matters, and especially to prevent imposition and

other abuses confessedly wont to occur, in connexion with the discovery and use of relics. Its present labours are chiefly occupied about the explorations carried on in the Roman catacombs, which have been for ages the great mine whence the Church has drawn her stores for the supply of the faithful with new and authentic relics. How easy it is to satisfy the "Congregation" in relation to the authenticity of a newly-discovered relic, will be seen by a reference to the subjoined case :—

"In 1802, a skeleton was found in one of the Roman catacombs, under a broken stone, on which were distinguishable the olive branch and the anchor, ordinary emblems on Christian tombs, and besides two arrows and a javelin, which appeared to indicate the burial-place of some martyr. These symbols were accompanied by an inscription, the beginning and end of which were wanting, thus : ' . . . lumena pax tecum fi . . . ' It was impossible to make it out. 'Lumena' was either the ending of some word, or an unknown word—'fi' the commencement of another word. At last a clever fellow extricated the Roman clergy from their difficulty. He wrote the inscrutable inscription in a circle, and then joined the syllable *fi* to the truncated word *lumena*. The whole, thus arranged, signified,† 'Peace to thee, Philomena'—a charming name for a saint, meaning 'beloved.'

"Pius VII. presented the skeleton of this new saint to a Neapolitan prelate, who was sent to compliment him, (the Pope.) Soon after, a priest was favoured with a vision in which the saint (Philomena) appeared to him, and informed him that she had suffered martyrdom because, having made a vow of celibacy, she refused to marry the emperor; and these interesting historical details were supplemented by an artist, who also had a vision, in which it was revealed to him that the name of the emperor was Dioclesian. Thanks to the Jesuits, St Philomena has met with a rapid success. She has churches in Naples and in Paris; and thus in the nineteenth century, with some unknown bones and some fragmentary syllables, they have created a name, a saint, a complete legend, and a new worship."—Eadie's *Ecclesiastical Cyclopedia*, p. 562.

This "development" will be apt to lead to the belief that the Congregation of Relics, in seeking to supply religious food for religious fools, have rather tended to increase than diminish the system of fraud which they were ostensibly instituted to deal with and correct.

Dr De Sanctis, in his interesting work, entitled "Popery

and Jesuitism at Rome," takes occasion to supply some notice of the Congregation of Relics, from which quotations are made. To avoid subjecting them to the surveillance of the Roman inquisition, the parties referred to in this work appear under representative names ; but we have the guarantee of Dr De Sanctis's high character that the relations are not the less true. He is describing the visit of certain parties to several of the committees, or congregations, which the Pope has organised at Rome, to enable him to exercise different functions of his infallibility. The party has just been visiting the Congregation of Indulgences :—

"On taking leave, we thanked the vice-secretary, (of the Congregation of Indulgences,) and proceeded to visit another office. As we were retiring, the priest told us that the Congregation of Indulgences adjoined the Congregation of Relics, and he invited us to go and see the 'depository.'"

The party having proceeded to the building named—

"The first chamber was ornamented with fragments of sepulchral stones, ancient glasses and vases, and other things of a similar character. The second room is full of wooden chests, died green, containing the relics of popular saints. In this room there are four priests, whose business it is to place the relics in shrines for distribution ; and you shudder to see *the tables covered with a confused mass of bones, teeth, pieces of old garments, hair, and so forth*, tumbled together with the greatest indecency, so that I could not believe they were relics till our priest assured me of the fact. I conclude the priests who distribute them do not believe in them ; if they did they would treat them less contemptuously. The third room is devoted to what is called the *grand relics*, relating to the apostles, the Virgin, and our Lord himself.

"He told us that they had a great quantity of common relics, which were daily replenished from the catacombs, but that they had very few of the more distinguished class. I asked how the Pope could decide whether the skeletons found in the catacombs belonged to the saints. 'The Pope (he replied) takes no interest in such matters ; he commits them all to the Cardinal-Vicar, and he in his turn devolves them on the Jesuit Father Marchi, who visits the remains as they are disinterred, and, when *he* believes them to have been saints, sends them here for us to baptize and distribute to the faithful.' To baptize ! I interrupted, with astonishment ; do you baptize dead bones ? The Custode explained that by baptizing he meant nothing more than naming them.

“We have some superior relics; relics of the twelve apostles, of St John the Baptist, some of the milk, the hair, and clothes of the Virgin; and then we have relics of our Lord—for instance, two thorns from the crown, a fragment of the true cross, parts of the title (written over it), of the robe without seam, of the reed, and other things of the same kind.”—P. 87. Ed. 1852. London.

The increasing incredulity even of Roman Catholics with regard to the genuine character of newly-discovered relics has lately led the priests to adopt a new and less suspicious mode of propagating the religion of relics. Instead of seeking to multiply relics by alleged new discoveries of the article, Italian genius has been enlisted in producing *models* of the old or the more authenticated of the relics so long held in repute. This has introduced a new class of worship, or the

Worship of Relic Models.

Mr T. G. Owens, a recent traveller in the East and in Italy, thus refers to this new development:—

“I had observed the walls of the city (of Rome) placarded with this announcement—‘Facsimiles of the chains of St Peter. The Commission, for the purpose of a pious work, charged with the making in steel of facsimiles of the chains of St Peter, *authorises the sale of them.*’

“‘*N.B.*—Notice is given to the devout that each of the said facsimiles, to which are annexed special benedictions by his Holiness, has touched the sacred chains in the Gudosian Basilica of St Peter in Vinculis.’

“I purchased the holy chains, and they, with all the special benedictions of his Holiness, cost three pauls, or about fifteenpence in British money. I also purchased the authorised pamphlet sold in Rome along with the holy chains.”

Mr Owen then supplies extracts from this “authorised” work, which are here inserted:—

“Towards the year 439, Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, gave the holy chains of St Peter to the Empress Eudoxia, wife of Theodosius the younger, and afterwards sent them to Rome by her daughter Eudoxia, wife of Valentine III., who built the splendid Basilica of St Peter in Chains.”—P. 15.

“It was not till the sixth century that the worship of the holy chains was decidedly established throughout the world.”—P. 17.

“The Holy Pontiff, desiring to compare the two chains, brought

them together, and, in the presence of those assembled, the two chains immediately joined, and formed only one!"—P. 25.

"A cup which, having touched the chains, was sent to an invalid, who, drinking out of it, was restored to health."—P. 27.

"In 969, the time of Pope John XIII., a man belonging to the Court of the Emperor Otho was possessed of a devil; and, upon having the chain put on his neck, the devil was driven out, with horrible contortions and roarings."—P. 28.

"The holy chains are preserved in a magnificent reliquary, given by Pius IX."—P. 30.

"By the intercession of the blessed Apostle Peter, God will deliver thee from all evil.' These words are said when the chains are presented to be kissed by the faithful."—P. 31.

"In 1837, the cholera in Rome was much mitigated by exposing the chains to those affected with it, if not entirely removed."—P. 34.

"In all great tribulations, these chains have always procured consolation when presented before the throne of mercy."—P. 35.

The apparent success which has attended this speculation in relic-modelling will doubtless lead to an extension of the system. We shall doubtless by and by have exhibited for similar sale plaster casts of saints' bones—models of the spear with which Christ was pierced—of the nails of His cross and the cross itself—and *facsimiles* of all the "grand relics" of which the Congregation of Relics are in possession.

Social Evils of Relic Worship.

No evil is so destructive of social morality, and, consequently, of social elevation and temporal prosperity and progress, as idolatry; no species of idolatry comprehends more of these social results than the he and she saint worship of the Papacy, and no form of this worship is more demoralising, or rather brutalising, than the worship given by Romans to the sainted bones, tatters, and other trumpery called relics. Perhaps one of the best arguments which can be employed to dispute the opinion that the saints are cognisant of the affairs of earth is, that which may be derived from the abuse to which the Papacy has applied their remains on earth. Were the saints in glory fully aware of the ways which the Pope's devotional

maniacs take to render homage to their names, how would "the saints reigning with Christ" be afflicted with an anguish and disgust far exceeding the worst experience of their earthly career! No department of Popery more effectively illustrates the fact that the officials and flocks of the Papacy stand in the respective relationship of knaves and fools than the department of relic worship. During the middle ages the principal occupation of the monks was the fabrication of legends to authenticate the miraculous virtues of the pretended bones, rags, and other appurtenances of the saints, which were either exhibited or sold at the monastic marts. To meet this species of swindling the Government of England were obliged to enact several stringent statutes:—

"Relics are forbidden to be used or brought into England by several statutes; and justices of peace are empowered to search houses for Popish books and relics, which, when found, are to be defaced and burnt," &c.—3 Jac. i., cap. 26. Buck's *Theological Dictionary*, *in loco*.

As it does not appear that these useful statutes have ever been repealed, while, from the continuance of relic frauds, they are just as necessary to-day as at any previous period, the question again arises why these statutes, like those formerly referred to as bearing on the obscene publications of the Papacy, should be allowed to remain a dead letter? Those who passed such necessary provisions against relic frauds made no distinction between profane and pious swindling, but at the present day the notion appears to have arisen that, while the former class of delinquencies is to be duly restricted here, the punishment of frauds committed in the name of religion, and under the sanction of ecclesiastical officials, is to be left to the judgment of a future world!

Some little hope has sprung up from a late occurrence that the pernicious distinction between profane and pious vice is attracting proper attention. In page 170 of this work a reference was made to the obscene publications of the Papacy associated with the confessional, and the bearings of Lord Campbell's and other acts upon such publica-

tions. Since the remarks referred to went to press, a case has occurred in which the possessor and circulator of some of the Popish pollutions referred to was convicted in an English court, and a quantity of books, containing some of the grossest sensual filth of Rome, was given to the flames by order of the magistrate who tried the case. See for a notice of the trial the *Romish Tablet* of March 23, 1867.

It is to be hoped that the same magisterial interposition will be yet applied to relic robbery, to Popish lotteries, and the various other forms of swindling by which the Romish priesthood are preying upon society in the name of religion.

John Ronge and the Holy Coat of Treves.

The book bearing the above title (Nelson, Edinburgh, 1845) should be read by all who wish to be instructed in the mysteries of relic robbery, and the social disorders which the system is capable of creating when not made subject to the coercive jurisdiction of the civil magistrate. It is to be regretted that space does not permit a more enlarged reference to the holy coat, or rather to the holy coats ; for it appears there has been at least *four* such coats exhibited to the faithful, each as the exclusively genuine garment.

John Ronge, a Roman Catholic priest of Silecia, being, like Luther in the case of indulgences, indignant with the doings of his bishop in reference to the exhibition of this relic, originated the movement which produced a great commotion in Germany at the time by an address dated 1st October 1844, and entitled—

“OPINION OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST IN REGARD TO THE HOLY TUNIC OF TREVES.”

“Christians of the nineteenth century—you have heard it—you know it—men of Germany, you know it—spiritual and temporal teachers of the German people, that which would once have sounded in our ears as a fable or a fiction, is neither a fiction nor a fable, but real truth and verity. Bishop Arnoldi of Treves has exhibited for the adoration and reverence of Christians a garment called the tunic of our Lord!

“According to the latest account, five hundred thousand persons

have already made a pilgrimage to see this relic, and every day fresh thousands flock to it, especially since the garment in question is found capable of curing diseases and working miracles.

“The news had spread among the people of all lands, while certain priests in France maintain that they alone possess the real tunic of Christ, and that the one at Treves is an imposture. Truly the saying here implies—‘He who can occupy his mind about such things without losing his reason, has none to lose.’ Five hundred thousand men, five hundred thousand intelligent Germans have already hastened to see or to adore a piece of dress at Treves! The greater number of these thousands are from the lower orders of the people, and, besides, in deepest poverty—oppressed, uneducated, stupid, superstitious, and, in part, demoralised. They *leave the cultivation of their fields, the labour of their workshops, the care of their households, the education of their children*, to take part in a heathen festival at Treves—a disgraceful spectacle which the Romish Church displays before their eyes. . . .

“Thousands of the pilgrims *deprive themselves of the necessities of life to raise the money for their journeys, and the offering which they make to the holy tunic*—THAT IS TO THE CLERGY. . . .

“Many wives and virgins sacrifice their purity of heart, and their chastity, destroying thus the peace, the happiness, and the comfort of their families. . . .

“And the man who publicly displays this piece of dress—the work of human hands—for reverent regard—who leads astray the religious feelings of the credulous, ignorant, or suffering people—giving thereby an impulse to vice and superstition—who wrings their substance from the poor and starving multitude—who entails on Germany the ridicule of other lands, and who draws more close together the heavy clouds which float already dark and dismally above our heads—this man is a bishop, a German bishop—it is Arnoldi, Bishop of Treves!”

“JOHANNES RONGE, *Catholic Priest.*”

It is much to be regretted that the remarkable social movement which the imposture of the holy coat originated at the period in Germany, subsequently collapsed through want of harmony among its different leaders, and the “secular arm” which Austria put forth to suppress a movement which threatened to produce a new edition of the German Reformation.

Eighth Article of the Creed.

“I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the mother of God, ever virgin, and also of the other saints, may be had and

retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them."

"Through God's high sufferance for the trial of man,
By falsities and lies, the greatest part
Of mankind they corrupted to forsake
God, the Creator, and th' invisible
Glory of Him that made them, to transform
Oft to the image of a brute, adorn'd
With gay religions, full of pomp and gold."

—*Paradise Lost.*

The Article quoted confines the practice of image-worship to the images of Christ, the virgin, and the saints; and many Roman Catholics, ignorant of the *whole* teaching of their Church, deny that the Church permits the use of any material representations of the *persons of the divine Trinity*. To set such Romanists square with their own theology, we refer them to their own standard, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which says:—

"To represent the *persons of the Holy Trinity*, by certain forms under which, as we read in the Old and New Testament, they deigned to appear, is not to be deemed contrary to religion or the law of God."—Donovan's *Translation*, part iii. cap. 2, sec. 36.

It is a principle in the worship of the Christian religion that the creature is to worship the Creator—that which is made to worship that which makes it. The religion of Romanism being the religion of Antichrist, and consequently in all respects the antithesis of Christianity, the principle of its distinctive worship is that the creator—that is, herself—is to worship the creature.

Does the Church worship the Host or Christ in the Host, the priest first proceeds to *create* or produce Christ in the Host "by the force of his words," (as the Council of Trent has it, Waterworth's edition, p. 78,) and then the priestly creator immediately engages in the worship of the devotional object produced by his own potential dictum.

Does the Church make a movement to worship any particular dead member of her body, the Pope first *creates* him a saint—that is, invests him with the claim to religious homage by the process of canonisation—and then

the Pope and his followers immediately proceed to offer homage to the individual whom he has sainted and authorised to receive the worship of the Church.

Again, does the Church wish to institute the worship of some particular image, or the image of some particular saint, she first *creates*, or manufactures and consecrates the image, and then the makers prostrate their bodies and souls before the piece of painted canvas, or the piece of timber, stone, or metal, to which she has decreed "due honour and veneration."

The wording of the eighth Article, which professes to enunciate the doctrine of image-worship, evinces an evident reluctance to be explicit on the doctrine of *image-making*. It says that images are to be "had and retained," two vague terms, misleadingly substituted for *manufactured and consecrated*.

Again, the Article is purposely obscure as to the worship to be referred to images. It says that *due* worship is to be given, but carefully abstains from declaring *what worship* is due worship. It was the more necessary to be pronounced and definite on this point, as every one conversant with the Romish controversy knows that Thomas Aquinas and other doctors of the Church teach that the type and antitype, or the image and the object represented, are to be worshipped with the *same* worship; and there is little doubt that many Romanists give even *more* worship to the image than to the original.

It must, however, be conceded that many Roman Catholics, presuming to gainsay such doctors as "St Thomas," deny that *any* worship is given to an image in their devotional system—that, according to the Council of Trent, the image is to be employed as a *means*, and not as an *object* of worship—that, in the words of the Council,

"The honour which is shown to them *is referred to the prototypes* which those images represent; in such wise, that by the images which *we kiss*, and before which we *uncover the head and prostrate ourselves*, we adore Christ and we venerate the saints whose similitude they bear."

To explain this distinction more perspicuously to the

unsophisticated, it is to be observed that the difference supposed to exist between the employment of images as objects and as means of worship, is that in the former the worship is said to be at least shared with the image, while in the latter case the homage is conceived to *pass through* the image, and to terminate in the original. This is what the Council of Trent means by “referring the honour to the prototype.”

As this is a dexterous attempt to parry the charge of idolatry which Protestants bring against the Church of Rome, some considerations are subjoined, with the view of examining whether, according to Scripture, the use of images even as “means,” and not as “objects” of worship, does not constitute the very worship which the Scriptures designate by the term idolatry. A very few passages of Scripture will be sufficient to determine this question. The first selected refers to the case of the “calf,” or image, which Aaron made to the Jews in the wilderness :—

Exod. xxxii. 5. “And when Aaron saw it, (or that the people welcomed and approved of the image he had made,) he built an altar before it; and Aaron made proclamation and said, To-morrow is a feast to the LORD.”

That is, according to the original for the term “Lord” here, to JEHOVAH, or the self-existing and true God—not to the image made to represent him. Accordingly, when the morrow came, the people engaged in the ceremonies of this feast “to Jehovah,” recorded in the next verse.

Exod. xxxii. 6. “And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings, and peace-offerings, (that is, to “the Lord,” or Jehovah,) and the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.”

Thus, in the whole of this transaction, there is no evidence whatever that the people engaged in it offered any worship whatever to the image which Aaron made to symbolise the presence of deity on the occasion; and yet the apostle Paul, referring to this procedure, designates those engaged in it “idolators.”

1 Cor. x. 7. “Neither be ye *idolators*, as were some of them, as

it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play."

Many other scriptures might be adduced to prove that the idolatry with which God so frequently charged the Jews was the employment of images, not as objects, but as means of worship. Another passage is selected, and to make it decisive to the Roman Catholic, the passage is cited from the Douay version.

Judges xvii. 1-5. "There was at that time a man of mount Ephraim whose name was Michas, who said to his mother, The eleven hundred pieces of silver which thou hadst put aside for thyself, and concerning which thou didst swear in my hearing, behold I have and they are with me. And she said to him, Blessed be my son by the Lord. So he restored them to his mother, who said to him, I have consecrated and vowed this silver to the Lord, that my son may receive it at my hand, and *make a graven and a molten god*, so now I deliver it to thee. And he restored them to his mother, and she took two hundred pieces of silver and gave them to the silversmith, to make of them a graven and a molten god, which was in the house of Michas. And he separated also therein a little temple for the god, and made an ephod and teraphim," &c.

Here is the clearest possible testimony that the idolatry of the Jews was the idolatry at present practised in Popery, or the use of images as a medium of worship. Nothing is more evident than that both Michas and his mother were sincere, however mistaken, worshippers of the one true God, and that the image employed was designed, like those employed by the devotees of Popery, merely as a means or aid to devotion. Yet that this was an idolatrous worship is evidenced by the translators of the Douay Bible themselves, as, compelled by the purport of the passage quoted, they head the chapter in which it occurs, "The history of the *idol* of Michas."

Hence, as the history of the idol of Michas is substantially the history of the idols of Romanism—as it was precisely the same use which Michas made of his image which every Roman Catholic professes to make of those provided by his Church—it follows that if Michas's image was an idol, and himself, for that reason, an idolator,

the images of Rome are similar idols, and the worshippers who use them similar idolators.

When Roman Catholics find themselves unsupported by Scripture, they are wont to seek argument in some of those sophistic analogies by which Rome so plausibly and successfully propagates her errors. In the present case, the religious use of images is advocated by a reference to the secular employment of paintings and images to preserve the memory and respect of departed relatives and friends. The argument drawn from the analogy is that, if our *natural* affections are aided by these pictorial means, why may not our *spiritual* or devotional feelings be helped by the same means? Granting, for argument sake, that spiritual and natural feelings can be sustained or improved by similar means, the means here employed are no way similar. When we wish to preserve the memory or cherish affection towards a departed friend by pictorial representations, we are careful to possess ourselves with a *likeness* of the deceased. A picture derived merely from the *imagination* of the artist, and which is consequently devoid of that *resemblance* in which lies the whole value of a portrait, can be of no service as a memorial of the original. It is the simple power of *likeness* in such a work that is capable of kindling the feelings towards the represented original. Granting, therefore, that a veritable portrait of Christ or St Peter would enliven our feelings in relation to the original, we have no such portrait; nor can we obtain it, as to supply it the artist would require the *same inspiration* to guide him in the work as that which guided the evangelists, when they delineated the moral likeness of the Saviour on the canvas of the four Gospels. If a material likeness would have enhanced our devotional feelings towards Christ, there cannot be a reasonable doubt that, as He inspired His servants to delineate His moral portrait in the Gospels, He would have similarly inspired some holy artist to supply us with such an image of His material person as would have best answered the desired end. But He has left us no such memorial. Contrary to the decree of the Council of Trent, Christ has providentially ordered that

His image is neither to be “had or retained;” and the attempts of Rome to provide us with what Christ thought better *not* to provide us, are but so many efforts to substitute the religion of the Council of Trent for the religion of Christ. Further, as every imaginary daub produced by the subsidised and often profligate artist of Rome is but a pictorial falsehood, more likely to resemble Judas than Jesus, or Simon Magus than Simon Peter, the picture-religion of Popery but serves to show that the visible is like the oral teaching of Rome, or that she *paints* as well as *speaks* lies in hypocrisy. Were some devotional community of Romanists to select some living beggar-man of their society, and place him on a pedestal to represent some deceased saint, the worship offered to the saint through such a medium would doubtless be as acceptable to the saint, if he had any voice in the matter, and far less criminal in the sight of God, than the stupid devotions offered through those caricatures in paint or plaster, or through those wood, stone, or metal models which she makes the inspiring medium of her debasing idolatry.

Development of Image-Idolatry.

The apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Church of Rome, takes an early opportunity of referring to the origin, development, and causes of image-worship, in the following words :—

Rom. i. 21–23. “Because that, when they (the heathen) knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into *an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.*”

When the heathen thus lost the knowledge of God, God did not “leave Himself without a witness” in the objects and operations of the natural world. These ever-present phenomena were referred to causes called “the powers of nature;” and as the heathen conceived that no object could be more worthy of man’s homage than these natural

powers, or their representative phenomena, the worship of man's intellect and heart came to be transferred from the Creator to His works.

The devotional faculty inherent in man, however, cannot be duly gratified by the worship of any object devoid of that personality which is proper to his own nature. Hence the heathen early *personified* or ascribed an *ideal* personality to the various objects and operations of nature,—thus the wind was personified and called *Æolus*; the sea was personified and called *Neptune*, &c., &c.

The next step in the development represented the presence and attributes of these personified or ideal deities by the art of the painter and the sculptor. Two more steps completed the development. The image which was at the first but the *symbol* of the imaginary deity next became a *medium*, and, finally, an *object* of worship. A Scripture reference will illustrate the whole process. The passion for hunting was personified and designated *Diana*. *Diana* was next represented by the painter and sculptor under the form of a beautiful female. This image was next set up in the temples, both as a medium and an object of worship. And, in the Scripture passage about to be quoted, to exalt and intensify this worship, her priests fabricated the legend that the image of *Ephesus* was the work of Divine, not human art—it “fell down from heaven!”

Acts xix. 35. “And when the town-clerk had appeased the people, he said, Ye men of *Ephesus*, what man is there that knoweth not that the city of the *Ephesians* is a worshipper of the great goddess *Diana*, and of the image which fell down from *Jupiter*.”

The story about the celestial origin of this *Ephesian* image would have been surprisingly marvellous if we had not been made familiar with far more wonderful prodigies related in the *Breviary*, and other *Popish* authorities, concerning the images of *Christ* and the saints, and, more especially, of the *Virgin*—the *Diana* of *Rome*.

Primary and Secondary Developments of Idolatry.

The distinction between the employment of images as

means and as objects of worship has already been referred to. But the distinction is so important as to require more special notice in tracing the development of idolatry. It has been scripturally shown that the original and proper signification of the term idolatry was the employment of an image as a medium or instrument of worshipping a legitimate object. It is easy to trace how the term came to be more, or rather almost exclusively, applied to the use of images, not as means, but as objects of worship. Gibbon, in referring to the introduction of image-worship into the Church, says,—“By slow, though inevitable progression, the honours of the original were *transferred to the copy*.” As this translation of the homage due to the living original, to a senseless piece of painting or statuary, greatly intensified the idolatry of the besotted worshipper, the term idolatry came to be more significantly and emphatically employed to denote the use of images as objects, rather than as means of worship. If, however, the *parent sin* must be worse than its offspring, it cannot be granted that the exclusive or even the special application of the term idolatry to the use of images as objects, rather than as media of worship, has any solid reason to support it.

When Gibbon says, that, by slow though inevitable progression, the honours designed for the original came to be transferred to the copy, he does not ask to explain the steps of what he has justly called an “inevitable progression.” The first step which tended to transfer worship from the “original” to the “copy,” was the idea that the image employed as a medium of prayer would also be made the medium of *returning an answer*; or, in other words, that the Divinity, addressed through an image, would invest the image with *miraculous virtue* for the benefit of the worshipper. Hence images came to be as much trusted in as a medium of receiving benefits as of rendering worship. Subsequently, from being merely the channels, they came to be regarded as the *depositories*, of miraculous virtue. When once superstition had thus realised the notion that the miraculous power and consequent divinity of the object worshipped was *inherent* in the image

before which he addressed his prayers, it was quite natural that the image and the object represented should come to be so closely identified as to receive at least equal worship. One more step completed the "inevitable progression." The image is the *visible* object to the mind of the worshipper. Hence, as the senses have the dominion over all other faculties in the mental system, images, instead of constituting a medium by which our feelings can ascend to the invisible, absorbed the religious sentiment; instead of sharing, they monopolise the devotional aspirations of the finished adolator.

Development of Image-Idolatry in the Jewish Church.

The Jews evidently came out of Egypt with a strong propensity to practise what they had been so much familiarised with in that land of idolatry. This propensity, although kept in check by the restrictions of the Jewish law, and especially by the second commandment of the Decalogue, ultimately affected the nation so much as to make it the chief cause of the providential punishments which culminated in their captivity. Conscious of this, after their return from Babylon, whatever other faults the nation fell into, the Jews became thoroughly cured of image-worship; and one of the chief sources of the Jewish hatred of Christianity was the early introduction of this idolatry into the nominally Christian Church. Further, not only was this development a constant cause of scandal, and preventative of conversion to the Jews, but the origin and success of Mohammedanism in the world may be largely ascribed to the early prevalence of image-adolatry in the Christian Churches. Mohammed saw that image-worship was conspicuously condemned by the Bible, and that the purification of his system from this idolatry would alone be an influential source of evidence to his followers that Christianity had apostatised from the teaching of Christ, and needed another prophet to purify and perfect divine religion. Accordingly, the Koran and its professors

are as hostile even as the Scriptures and the Jews are to every form of image-worship.

Development of Image-Idolatry in the Christian Church.

The introduction of image-worship into the Christian, or nominally Christian, Church, like all other developments of Popery, was gradual. Roman Catholics themselves admit that there was no such thing as the employment of images in the Christian Church before the fourth century; and their mode of accounting for the discrepancy between the ancient and modern Church in this respect is characteristically plausible :—

“ The Church in the early ages abstained from the use of images, lest their use might be prejudicial to the heathen before they became sufficiently acquainted with the spirit of Christianity to be able to distinguish between a true and false application of images ! ”

In accordance with the fact that the early Church rejected, or rather abhorred, the devotional employment of images, one of the charges of Celsus, the Epicurean philosopher, and the earliest polemic writer against Christianity, (A.D. 150,) was that they had *no images*.—Neander's *Church History*, vol. i. p. 123. Clarke's ed.

In the same volume we are informed that images were first introduced, doubtless, with pure but mistaken motives, by private individuals and for private use, as *souvenirs* or memorials of Christ and the saints.—P. 399.

Images were first introduced into the *churches*, but only for artistic, ornamental, or decorative purposes, in the fourth century.—Neander, vol. iii. pp. 392–3.

The next important stage towards the introduction of image-worship among professing Christians was effected by that great architect of the Papacy, Gregory I., who provided or sanctioned the use of images in the Church for the historical instruction of the ignorant. In an age of growing darkness, these “ books of the ignorant,” as they were called, might have had a pardonable use; but the innovation was dangerous, and what was first intended

merely to instruct the intellect soon began to create those idolatrous emotions which led to the use of images, first as media, and second as objects of worship.

The change from instructive to devotional pictures, and from devotional pictures to devotional images, was brought to a climax in the eighth century by Gregory II., whose patronage of image-worship originated some of the most important ecclesiastical and political results in the history of the Church and the world—the ecclesiastical result being no less than the ultimate separation of the Greek and Roman Churches, and the political the like separation of the Greek and Roman empires.

The Greek Church having taken the opposite side from the Roman in the year 754, met in the Council of Constantinople, called by the Greeks the Seventh General Council, and decided against the principle and practice of image-worship.

On the other hand, the Western Council, called the Second Council of Nice, in the year 786 revoked the decree of the preceding Greek Council, and established image-worship in most of the churches of the Latin division of the empire. The Churches which still held out against the decrees of this latter Council were chiefly those of France, Germany, and Britain. The Emperor Charlemagne having taken sides with the Greek Church, in the year 794 called a council of western bishops at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, which decided against the worship of images as unscriptural and idolatrous.

In the ninth century, the controversy was renewed among the Greeks, and ultimately settled in favour of image-worship by the Council of Constantinople, assembled by the Emperor Theodora, in the year 842.

Subsequently, in the west, the Churches gradually swerved from the decisions of the Council of Frankfort, and submitted to the decrees of the second Council of Nice.

Modern Developments of Image-Worship.

In the controversies which have been thus briefly no-

ticed, and which, as has been seen, ended in the triumph of image-worship, we are not to suppose that the Church of Rome neglected to support her cause by arguments. When Scripture and reason could afford her no assistance, in this case she sustained the credit of images by those miraculous proofs which she draws upon so successfully with the credulous.

One would have thought that the light of the nineteenth century would have been unfavourable to the present-day success of this evidence ; but Rome knows how to exclude the light. She illuminates her worship with wax-candles instead of reason ; and, within the dim religious gloom of her cathedral walls, numbers of her present-day votaries have seen pictures winking and statues nodding to the faithful. But the most popular evidence in favour of image-worship at the present day, as well as in past times, is the healing power alleged to be manifested to the devout touch of the believing invalid. Space will not permit many illustrations. One is selected because of the credit it still retains for its healing virtue. Protestant pilgrims to Rome, like Seymour and Dickens, have given us descriptions of the Italian *Bambino*, which would have been stigmatised as caricatures if we had not similar testimony by Roman Catholic pens, from one of which the subjoined description is derived.

Worship of the Roman Puppet called the Bambino.

The reader is to be apprised that the Bambino (plural Bambini, for there are several individuals of the genus) is an Italian doll, made to represent Christ in His infancy. The Roman specimen of the article, its pedigree, and the use made of it, is thus admirably described by a writer in a late number of a Roman Catholic organ, the *Weekly Register*. The writer is describing the Romish feast of the Epiphany in the present year :—

“The weather was dubious, but it did not interfere with the great spectacle of the day—the benediction of the Bambino. . . . This Bambino, as you may know, is venerated for the *singular cures* wrought by devotion to it. It was *made* by a pilgrim in the Holy Land ; and many miraculous causes led to its being placed at

Ara Cœli. It may often be met passing to the sick in the arms of the monk, its guardian, [nurse;] for it has had a *carriage* for that purpose, maintained by pious persons, for now many years long. In the Revolution of 1849, the triumvirs of Rome made it a *present of the Pope's state carriage*. As it passes slowly along, with the stole of the monk out of the carriage window, it may be recognised by the devotion of the people of all ranks, who *reverently genuflect*. It is barely two feet high. The swaddling-clothes are of rich white silk, crested with superb jewels given at various times, and on its head is an imperial crown of gold, rich with gems. The material is wood of the mount of Olives. After the *Function*, (officials,) the devout go by relays to kiss the feet in the pretty chapel of the Bambino. Great numbers did so on Epiphany night—among others several Jesuit fathers, and some of the highest Roman princes.”—*Weekly Register*, January 19, 1867.

Social and Political Associations of Image-Worship.

The influence of this debasing idolatry upon the character of individuals and communities cannot be more significantly illustrated than by the evidence supplied by the preceding quotation of the more than heathenly condition of the Italian population. When we are told that even “the highest Roman princes” join in the worship of this devotional doll, draped in toggery and bejewelled in the fashion of an Indian idol, and that they pay the priests for the remedial virtue alleged to be communicated to the sick by the touch of this sacerdotal toy, have we not evidence that all attempts to ameliorate the social and political condition of the Italian people must continue to be utterly abortive until the axe is laid to the root of that superstition which is the exclusive cause of their secular and political debasement? It is only as politicians *learn the lesson and proceed on the principle that right religion is the basis of right legislation, that we can ever expect to see their efforts crowned with success.*

No corruption of the Christian religion has a more direct and powerful tendency to destroy its salutary influence in society, than the pollutions of image-worship. Hence, such a tendency to vitiate society should ever lead civil powers to apply such corrections to this evil as their authority and office rightly empower them to exercise. Hence it was that when Gregory II. became the patron and promoter of this

idolatry in the eighth century, the great Emperor Leo, and subsequently the French Emperor, Charlemagne, early bestirred themselves to take measures for the suppression of this vice among their corrupted subjects. As already intimated, the Pope's collision with the former led to one of the most important political as well as ecclesiastical changes which history records. As the case has an instructive bearing on the relation of the civil power to religion, it deserves some more special notice.

The introduction of Christianity, as a recognised and approved institution of the Roman empire, was effected by the Emperor Constantine. It cannot be denied that the Christian Church at that period (323) was not merely totally free from the use of images in its devotional services, but showed the utmost hostility to the image-worship of the heathen. If the Roman emperor had become convinced of the evils resulting from this practice among his heathen subjects, and if the Christian religion had become in his time vitiated by the similar practice of image idolatry, it will scarcely be denied that he would have been justified in refusing to allow its institutions to be set up and its principles propagated in the empire. Again, if the Christian religion was free from this idolatry in the age of Constantine, and if he gave its institutions and teaching a recognised and approved admission to the empire on account of its freedom from heathen impurities, and if in after ages, or in the reign of subsequent emperors, the rulers of the Church came to "develop" principles and practices which so changed those of Christianity as to leave it no longer the same religion as it was when the Roman civil power gave it a privileged admission to the State, it will scarcely be denied that the succeeding emperors would be justified in suppressing such developments, and especially such innovations, as they judged were calculated to deteriorate the morals of their subjects, and tended to temporal injury of the commonwealth.

Well, the cases thus introduced by supposition are precisely what occurred as facts in the history of the Church and the empire.

First, Constantine engrafted on the Roman State, the institutions of the Christian religion, when it was free from the doctrines and practice, and consequent corruptions, of image-worship.

Second, The rulers of the Church developed this idolatry under succeeding emperors, and more especially Gregories II. and III., under the Emperor Leo.

Third, the Emperor Leo, feeling that this development was largely traducing his subjects back to the idolatry of heathenism, felt justified in attempting to suppress an innovation which effectually changed Christianity from that condition in which his predecessor Constantine allowed it an establishment in the empire.

But by the time this attempt was made, Popery had become strong and the civil power had become weak—the growing strength of the one being in fact that which produced the growing weakness of the other. The Gregories, therefore, were able to resist the attempts of the emperor to suppress image-worship; and thus, for want of *timely* effort on the part of the civil power, the Popes succeeded not only in establishing idolatry in the Roman empire, but the triumph of the Pope over the Emperor was finally the cause of severing from the latter all those western provinces of the empire, and transferring them to the sway of Charlemagne and his successors.

From this triumph of the Gregories over the civil power, the population of Europe was left entirely subject to the influences of an idolatry whose effects have created the most debasing social results in every country where image-worship has not been either abolished or neutralised by the principles of the Reformation.

Ninth Article of the Creed.

“I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.”

“Though true the Pope has lost his interest here,
And pardons are not sold as once they were,
No Papist more desirous to compound
Than some grave sinners upon English ground.”

The word indulgence is a very soothing term for a very soothing doctrine. We are told by the Article that Christ left this indulgent power to the Church; but the Article would have been more explicit if it had said Christ left this power to *the Pope*. No authority can be more trustworthy on this point than that of Pope Leo X., the Pope whom Luther controverted on this the first controverted doctrine of Popery at the Reformation.

“The Roman Church, whom all other churches are bound to follow as their mother, hath taught that the *Roman Pontiff*, the successor of St Peter in regard to the keys, and the vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, possessing the power of the keys, by which power all hindrances are removed out of the way of the faithful—that is to say, the guilt of actual sins by the sacrament of penance, and the temporal punishment due for those sins, according to the Divine justice, by ecclesiastical indulgence—that the *Roman Pontiff* may for reasonable causes, by his apostolic authority, grant indulgences, out of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, to the faithful who are united to Christ by charity, as well for the living as for the dead; and that, in thus dispensing the treasure of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints, *he* either confers the indulgence by the method of absolution, or transfers it by the method of suffrage. Wherefore, all persons, whether living or dead, who really obtain any indulgence of this kind, are delivered from so much temporal punishment, due according to Divine justice for their actual sins, as are equivalent to the value of the indulgence bestowed and received.”—Cramp’s *Text-Book of Popery*, p. 337.

Thus the Pope is the exclusive treasurer of the “treasure of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints,” and he dispenses the treasure in either of two forms, called respectively “the method of absolution” and the “method of suffrage.” Before noticing these two forms of applying an indulgence, it will be necessary to offer some explanations touching the nature of an indulgence itself.

The object of an indulgence is one which grows out of the justification proper to Romanism, in which, after the eternal punishment due to sin is pardoned, a temporal penalty is said to remain, which the sacrament of penance can never remit. This temporal penalty is remitted by an indulgence. The Church of Rome is very anxious to explain that an indulgence does not remit *sin*—that it does not

accomplish what is effected in the Protestant system by *sanctification*.

To sustain the doctrine of a temporal punishment after the eternal is pardoned, Rome constantly adduces such cases as that of David, who was punished by the death of his son after Nathan had delivered the message of his forgiveness, (2 Sam. xii.)—Challoner's *Catholic Christian Instructed*, p. 176. Ed. 1851.

This and similar misapplications of Scripture are peculiarly suicidal, when produced as a basis upon which to raise the doctrine of indulgence ; for, in the first place, it proves that God *reserves to Himself* the power of correcting the sinner's offences—that, through the agency of His providence, and not through the mimic judicature of a priest, He “visits the iniquity of His people with the rod, and their transgressions with stripes.” In the next place, while the temporal punishment adjudged by the priestly mimic is as easily cancelled as imposed, the temporal chastisements of God are as much beyond the power of the priest to remove as the calamitous effects of an earthquake or a thunderstorm. In the last place, in all the scriptural cases to which Rome refers, the punishment never was *remitted at all* !

Next, to understand the ground, or the legal basis of an indulgence, the inquirer must observe that the Church of Rome holds two forms of justifying works—works of *ero-gation*, and works of *supererogation*. Those who can perform the first meet all the demands of the divine laws for sin ; those who can perform the second *more than* meet the demands of justice, and consequently have some satisfaction to spare. Between these two classes, however, there is a third and a much more numerous class than either—namely, those who can render no satisfaction, or who can render some, but not sufficient, satisfaction for their sins to God ; and to *this class, and this class exclusively, is an indulgence applicable*. The legal foundation of this application is ingeniously plausible, and perhaps exceeds in this respect anything else devised by the lying power of the Papacy. As in natural, so in spiritual things, the poverty of the poor

is supplied from the abundance of the rich ; and those who cannot make satisfaction for themselves may have their defective merit implemented from the surplus stock of satisfaction which belongs to the credit of such as have performed works of supererogation. In the sacramental system of justification, the principle of "imputation" is contemptuously discarded by the Papacy, but pure imputation, or the ideal transfer of satisfaction to the party indulged, is the legal basis of the pardon conveyed by an indulgence.

Indulgences are divided into *plenary* and *partial* ; and, to understand the significancy of the distinction, it is necessary to refer to the peculiar class of penance called "canonical," and which laid the basis for the development of indulgences. In the early ages of the Church, public sinners were laid under the obligation of performing certain penitential observances, chiefly repetitionary fasts and prayers, before they were re-admitted to church-fellowship. These fasts, &c., were regulated by the character and frequency of the sin for which they were adjudged. Some sins of a less heinous nature required but a few days penitential works ; others more offensive required weeks, months, and years ; and when a great crime, such as adultery, was often repeated, a whole lifetime—or rather a vast series of years, extending beyond the period of life—would not afford time for the performance of the penances adjudged to each act of the sin, according to the canonical scale which ruled the churches. In the development of the sacrament of penance, these canonical penances were entirely obliterated, and the temporal punishment due to sins was left to be regulated, not by the old scale, but by the judgment of the sacerdotal god who came to usurp the judgment-seat of Christ in the confession-box. But, while the canonical penances themselves were thus transmuted into what are now called sacramental penances, the present-day indulgence remits the *canonical*, and not the *sacramental* penance.

Even good controversialists are usually left bewildered by the muddle in which this twofold penitential system

of the Papacy has involved the doctrine of indulgence ; and this cannot be wondered at, as the Popish doctors themselves are obviously more than usually perplexed how to get themselves understood on the subject. Bishop Hornihold (*"Real Principles of Catholics,"* 1838) tries to put an intelligible face on the matter thus :—

"How does an indulgence take off the obligation of personal satisfaction ?

"It takes off the *penal*, but not the *medicinal* part."—P. 223.

Thus Hornihold divides penances into two parts or sorts—the one "penal," the other "medicinal," or morally remedial. If this distinction does not coincide with that between canonical and sacramental penance, then the muddle is in no degree clarified, and if it does, then the bishop has introduced some consistency into his theology, at the expense of opposing the general teaching of his Church on the subject of sacramental penances, which are universally taught to be a penal restitution or satisfaction for sin, and not a mere "medicinal" or corrective application, corresponding to what Protestants understand by chastisement.

Before referring to the process by which indulgences are applied, a few quotations confirmatory of the preceding statements respecting the principles of indulgences are subjoined, from one of the most elaborate and authoritative of the present-day standards of the Church of Rome :—

"It is certain that the satisfaction made by our Saviour far surpassed the punishment due to sin, because, in whatever light we view that satisfaction, it is infinite. Only one drop of His most precious blood—the least of His actions offered to His Father—was sufficient to redeem a thousand worlds."—Bishop Bouvier *on Indulgences*. London : Burns. 1848. P. 26.

One of the devices by which the devil invests the Papacy with so much "deceivableness of unrighteousness," is an overstrained laudation of Christ, at *the expense of truth*. Every one who understands the gospel knows that God does nothing, much less inflict pain, unnecessarily.

Least of all could He afflict Christ with one superfluous pang, or cause Him to lose a single drop of blood beyond what was necessary for human redemption.

“Many of the saints made more *satisfaction than their sins required . . .* have offered to God *much more abundant satisfaction* than they owed to His divine justice!

“But inasmuch as these same works are satisfactory, they have not been applied to their whole extent. The part which still exists unapplied cannot be forgotten by God, but is preserved, if we may so speak, in His memory, and this we call the *Treasury of the Church*, or the fund from which the Church draws when she grants indulgences.”—*Ibid.*

The Popish theologian makes use of the term Church whenever his object is to put a blind on the laity, as it respects some point upon which he is anxious not to be over explicit. Hence the phrase just quoted, “Treasury of the Church,” instead of “Treasury of the *Pope* ;” and “the fund from which the Church draws when she grants an indulgence,” instead of from which the *Pope* draws when *he* grants, &c.

This fund being so inexhaustible, it might be inferred that, as the Pope had no occasion to be chary of such a treasure, he would have been willing to dispense it with the utmost liberality. But the “Church”—that is, the Pope—has judged otherwise ; and hence while he sometimes “grants a *plenary* indulgence,” he much more frequently grants but a “*partial* indulgence,” out of the funds of the treasury.

By a plenary indulgence, is to be understood a full or complete remission of the temporal punishment due to sin ; and the effect is such that Bishop Bouvier says :—

“A plenary indulgence, if gained and applied to its full extent, would remit the whole of the temporal punishment due to the sins committed up to the time of its being gained ; so that if a person were to die immediately after having gained a plenary indulgence, *he would immediately enter heaven.*”—P. 21.

A partial indulgence, on the contrary, is a very niggardly boon, and is often restricted to a few days’ or a few weeks’ remission of the penances called canonical.

We are now in a position to explain the two forms of applying an indulgence, which are referred to in the quotation from Leo X.—namely, by the “method of absolution,” and by “the method of suffrage.” The simple significance of this distinction is that, in order to conceal his imposture in the case, the Pope has to employ one form of communicating an indulgence to the living, and another to the dead. To the living he professes to deliver a personal discharge from the debt of temporal punishment; so that the individual receiving a plenary indulgence in this way, called “the method of absolution,” is warranted to believe that, if he was to die immediately after, he would go straight to glory, without the necessity of a passage through Purgatory. But if *the same* individual were to die without receiving such a discharge during lifetime, and if his friends were to procure a plenary indulgence, to be applied in purgatory, the Pope refuses to be responsible for the similar efficacy of his indulgence when applied there. He will give no similar guarantee that his indulgence has had the same effect in relation to the dead as it would have had in relation to the living man, *for the obvious reason that this would at once conflict with and ultimately destroy the mass trade.* Were the Pope to profess to apply a plenary indulgence to a purgatorial prisoner by “the method of absolution,” or by a clear and straightforward discharge professing to release the prisoner, then, as a matter of course, all would prefer to procure an indulgence for the dead, instead of a mass or any number of masses for the same object. Hence he applies an indulgence to the dead by the “method of suffrage or prayer”—that is, the method of *masses*; for this is the only form in which the priest will consent to offer his prayers or intercessional advocacy as a means of applying an indulgence to the dead.

An indulgence by way of absolution—that is, an indulgence for the living—is generally given by the Pope’s deputies, more especially by the agency of his bishops. But if the applicant has money enough to seek an indulgence direct from the fountain-head, he need not despair of

success if he follows the instructions supplied for the case by Bishop Bouvier :—

“A petition to his holiness is drawn up and sent to Rome to some person who will be willing to present it to the prelate charged with this office, and to obtain the grant. If it be addressed to the Pope, and sent direct by post, it may possibly be answered—we indeed know cases of it; but it is a liberty which no one ought to take.

“Every grant of Indulgence is essentially *gratuitous*; and of this the Council of Trent forms a special precept, (sess. 21, cap. 9.) But the trouble, the care, and the labour of those who expedite it; the expenses, the journey to and fro of the agents employed, ought to be compensated; this cannot be expected to be done gratuitously. The expense of obtaining an indulgence is now greater than in former times.

“As all bishops have their correspondents (in Rome) for the affairs of their dioceses, it would be more expedient to make use of their agency, if they will allow it; but the *expenses must be borne by those who solicit the indulgence.*”

Thus although “the power of indulgence was left by Christ to Peter and his successors,” Peter’s successors do not succeed him in the gratuitous dispensation of the article of which they assume the power to bestow. But Bishop Bouvier says the cash payments demanded for an indulgence are only to compensate the trouble incurred in the granting of it,—a mode of defence which would make the services of lawyers, doctors, and almost every profession equally gratuitous.

Bishop Bouvier then goes on to facilitate applications by supplying further instructions, including—

“MODEL OF A PETITION TO THE POPE TO OBTAIN AN INDULGENCE.

“BEATISSIME PATER,

“Rector Parochiæ vulgo dictæ N.N. diocesis N.N. in Gallia ad pedes sanctitatis vestræ devotissime procumbens,” &c.

“MOST BLESSED FATHER,

“The rector of the parish commonly called N.N., in the diocese, N.N. in Gallia, most devoutly prostrating himself at the feet of your Holiness,” &c.

We may be excused from further quoting or translating a document which is merely a fulsome act of Pope worship.

As the preceding remarks supply but a very slender

representation of the doctrine of indulgence, and as no doctrine of Popery is more obscured with complications, or needs more careful unravelling to make it intelligible and to refute it, some additional treatment of this department of Popery is subjoined, beginning anew with the question—

What is an Indulgence?*

In referring to the instructions of the Church on this head, we shall select for our guide one of the most popular and approved little works containing information on the subject, and entitled “Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs,” published by “The Catholic Book Society,” 10 Essex Bridge, Dublin. Our readers must not forget that, according to the teaching of the Church and the title of this little book, “Sovereign Pontiffs” alone can grant indulgences in the first instance; and Bouvier, the standard writer on this department of the Church’s theology, says, that he not only has this power to grant them, but that “he could, if he pleased, wish, and *wish effectually*, that the grace *should cease* in all places, which revocation (or calling back of what he granted by indulgences) would be valid.”—P. 54, edition of 1848.

As indulgences are to remit some sort of punishment connected with sin, the little book very judiciously begins with the beginning, and tells us that “this punishment is of two kinds, the one *eternal*, and the other *temporal*.” It then says that the guilt and eternal punishment are remitted “in the holy sacrament of penance,” but that “all the temporal punishment is not *generally* forgiven in the sacrament.” Here, then, are two punishments depending, of course, upon *two guilts*; for after the one guilt is pardoned in the sacrament a temporal punishment remains, for which the sinner wants additional pardon; and as he who wants pardon for something must be guilty of something, this unpardoned or temporal punishment must be the result of the other guilt not pardoned in the sacrament.

* The observations forming an answer to this question have already appeared in print in one of a number of articles supplied by the present writer for the superintendents of a mission with which he was formerly connected.

After this preparatory explanation, the little book goes on to define an indulgence thus :—" An indulgence is the remission of the temporal punishment which generally remains due to sin already forgiven in the sacrament of penance, as to the guilt and eternal punishment," or rather, as we have seen above, as to the guilt *of the* eternal punishment. The case would be now pretty plain if the little book had only explained precisely what is the nature of the temporal punishment to which it refers. It cannot, of course, mean the temporal punishment *sent by God* for the punishment of sin—such as the potato rot and famine with which God so lately afflicted Ireland, or such as later still He sent, is sending, and *will continue to send* upon the Pope himself, for his past and present blasphemies. But a few years ago he was obliged to flee from his own city in the disguised and disgraceful condition of a lackey, and having forced himself back upon his flock, he now reigns only by virtue of the bayonets and sabres which he has blessed to slaughter the sheep of his own immediate fold. Wisely, therefore, has the little book said, " All the temporal punishment is not generally forgiven by the sacrament of penance," neither, of course, by an indulgence ; for no men ever endured a larger amount of the temporal curses of God than the Popes who made the sacrament, and who grant indulgences.

The *only other* temporal punishment to which the little book can refer is the penitential punishment, or the *penances* which a priest declares he has power to impose on a Roman Catholic at or after confession, and which penances or their effect he calls *satisfaction*. Now, we object to the little book for not making this distinction between the providential or temporal punishment which God inflicts, and the penitential or temporal punishment which the priest inflicts ; and, therefore, in order to give you a better answer to the question, " What is an Indulgence ?" we must correct the little book thus :—" An indulgence is the remission of the *penance* or *satisfaction* which, according to the priest, generally remains due for sins already forgiven as to the guilt and eternal punishment."

Having thus given our first answer to the question "What is an Indulgence?" we proceed to obtain another from the teaching of the little book. When the little book says above, that "the temporal punishment is not *generally* forgiven in the sacrament of penance," this, of course, implies that it may be and is *sometimes* forgiven in the sacrament; and as it gives no reason why the Church has chosen to pardon this punishment sometimes by the sacrament and sometimes by an indulgence, we must only suppose that the choice of these *two ways of doing the same thing* depends upon the Pope's pleasure. Hence an indulgence may now be defined, "A method of remitting the temporal punishment or penance due for sin, when the Pope or the priest does not chose to pardon it by a sacrament."

After the last quotation taken from the little book, it goes on with its instructions thus:—"This remission of temporal punishment (that is, of penances) is made by the application of the merits and satisfactions (that is, the merits *of the* satisfactions, for all merit is founded on satisfaction) which are contained in the treasures of the Church. These treasures are the accumulation (or store) of the spiritual goods arising from the infinite merits and satisfactions of Jesus Christ, with the superabundant merits and satisfactions of the blessed Virgin Mary, of the holy martyrs, and of the saints, which ultimately derive their efficacy from the merits and satisfactions of Christ." And, of course, the efficacy of his merits is also derived from theirs, *for his own are not sufficient without theirs*. The little book then calls this store the Treasury of the Church, and the "ground and matter of indulgences,"—that is, the stock out of which the Pope draws the merits and satisfactions which he applies for the remission of temporal punishment or penances. In the *Italian* system of book-keeping, every schoolboy knows "stock" is the first and principal account, and represents the capital of the stockholder or banker—in this case the Pope. Our readers must excuse us if we are obliged to use illustrations. Without such helps indulgences really cannot be understood.

The fourfold nature of the stock throws some light on a difficulty which came in our way above, or upon the difference between the pardon of punishment by the sacrament of penance and by an indulgence. When the temporal punishment is pardoned by the sacrament, it appears the pardon is given on the grounds of the satisfactions of Christ, together with such as may be supplied by some sort of good works performed by the penitent himself; but, in pardon by an indulgence, these are not sufficient; and there is also this difference—pardon by an indulgence excludes the *penitent's own satisfaction*, and supplies its place by the other human satisfactions derived from the stock.

This explanation, and the nature of the stock, enable us to give you another answer to the question at the head. The stock is a joint capital, consisting of four classes of merits and satisfactions—first, those of Christ, which the little book says are *infinite*. This satisfaction, therefore, is *too much*, for that which is infinite cannot be exhausted. But, according to the explanations of our little book, the merits and satisfactions of Christ can only be too much *when pardon is given by the sacrament*, for when a pardon is granted by an indulgence the stock has to be *increased*; it *then* requires the other three parts of the capital or those supplied by the Virgin Mary, martyrs, and saints, and which were over and above their own wants. Hence, “an indulgence is a pardon in which the temporal punishment is remitted, not by virtue of the satisfaction of Christ, which is too little, but by virtue of the superfluous satisfaction made by the Virgin, the martyrs, and saints.”

Our little book then takes care to remark that, “It is not in the power of each Christian to gain indulgences in any way *he* pleases.” This remark is made preparatory to the following—“Hence we distinguish two sorts of indulgences—*plenary* and *partial*. By a plenary indulgence we gain the remission of all the temporal punishment,” that is, of all the penances required on the penitent's part. “Partial indulgences are of some days, quarantines, or years; that is, *so much* of the punishment is remitted as would be

satisfied for by the due performance of the penances" required for the space of time. Notwithstanding the magnitude of his treasury, you see the Pope is chary of it. Sometimes he gives a receipt in full, but in the majority of cases he prefers retaining a part of the debt against the creditor. "O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee *all that debt*, because thou desiredst me: shouldst not thou also have compassion on thy fellow-servant, as I had pity on thee?" —Matt. xviii. 33. This is the way Christ pardons in *His Church*. He forgives "all the debt;" but the Pope will let his stock go to waste, and millions of his flock to die and go to the dismal fire of Purgatory, rather than give them a plenary indulgence leaving the world. We shall see the *reason* of this immediately. In the meantime, the last distinction made by our little book as to partial and plenary indulgences compels us to give a fresh answer to the question at the head. "An indulgence is the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin, either by so much forgiven on account or by an acquittal in full according to the Pope's pleasure," it not being "in the power of each Christian to gain indulgences in any way he chooses."

Our little book then goes on to enumerate various other classes of indulgences to which we have no space to refer, except by naming them. These indulgences are called *temporary, perpetual, local, real, and personal*, all which are granted on principles which perfectly accord with the trade system of Italian book-keeping. Even the very names we see are borrowed. Every one knows the distinction between *real* and *personal* accounts in the art referred to. According to the details of our little book, the banker or the Pope opens some of these purgatorial accounts with religious orders, called confraternities; others with certain chapels, privileged altars, &c. These indulgences are so diversified and complicated in their properties that they baffle our ability to define them here. We, therefore, proceed to others of a simpler character. One of the most *interesting* of these is the indulgence granted for purgatorial relief. On this subject our little book says—"In-

dulgences are also applicable to the suffering souls in purgatory ;” and in the next page, (10,) speaking of the “faithful departed,” it says, “Whenever in their favour we fully gain a plenary indulgence which is applicable to them, the soul to whom the indulgence is especially applied, *if it be* (a good condition this) in purgatory, that moment is liberated from the painful flames, and is received into glory.” Good news this for the people, but very bad news for the priests ; for granting that the Pope might deem it an extravagant use of his stock to evacuate purgatory by a universal plenary indulgence, *which, of course, he could do*, yet it is obvious that his granting such a favour even to individuals must in each case obviate the necessity of masses. Every one must see that if a living friend could get a deceased one out of “the painful flames” by a plenary indulgence, all would, of course, take this plan of delivering their friends from torment at once, rather than adopt the mass plan of getting them out by inches ; and as a consequence all must equally see that in this case masses would immediately fall to zero in the market, the priests would be broken merchants, and the Pope himself might not be a gainer in the end, even though his indulgences went off at as high a figure as in the days of Tetzels. Thus, as an indulgence and a mass, like “two negatives in English,” destroy one another, and as it was desirable to keep both in operation, it became necessary to regulate the virtues of purgatorial indulgences in such a way as to make them marketable, and at the same time not diminish the value of masses. Of course, our little book teaches the way this is done, and here is the way—“The soul to whom an indulgence is especially applied, if it be in purgatory, that moment is liberated from the painful flames, and is received into glory, *provided (!) the Divine justice designs to accept of it in her favour !*” Thus, we see, the difficulty is fairly encountered ; for even after a plenary indulgence is granted it may be flanked by masses, on the ground that the Divine justice *may not* have accepted the value of the plenary. How wise the Pope is ! But let us see the wickedness of

his wisdom. The Church teaches that every soul in purgatory is free from guilt and eternal punishment, and a plenary indulgence remits "all the temporal punishment due to sin, after the guilt and eternal punishment are pardoned;" but the Pope says, the Divine *justice* may not be satisfied even with the payment of the whole debt; that is, his *justice* may not be satisfied with *justice*—nothing but injustice, or more than what justice demands, can satisfy the Divine Creditor! Is it not a plain case, that in order to cover his diabolical roguery, this unprincipled trader would make God a partner in robbing the world in the name of justice?

According, then, to the last information derived from our little book—"A purgatorial indulgence is a plenary or partial remission of the 'painful flames,' with a provisional clause which leaves the success of the Pope's grant in such a state of uncertainty, as makes it advisable not to depend on it without the addition of masses."

We now come to the most extraordinary part of the instructions contained in our little book. You will recollect that an indulgence is said to be "the remission of the temporal punishment or penance due to sin," and that a "plenary indulgence is the remission of *all* the temporal punishment or penances due to sin." With these two statements of the Church before us, what do you think of the following—"It would, *however* (!), be a fatal delusion for any one to make himself certain of having obtained the remission of all the punishment due to mortal sin by *gaining* (!) an indulgence; SO AS TO NEGLECT THE PRACTICE OF PENANCE!!"

Our marks of admiration may possibly be taken by some in the best sense; that is, as expressing admiration at the candour of the little book, in acknowledging the sheer dupery and imposture of all its previous statements. But though the little book admits that the temporal punishment or penance which is pardoned by an indulgence has *still to be endured*, and to consider it pardoned or to believe that the indulgence had been "gained" would be "a fatal delusion," yet, as this confession has a base

and shameless object in view, we cannot give it the meed of candour. We have already seen, in the case of a purgatorial indulgence, that its success had to be left in *profitable* uncertainty, and now we have to see that when an indulgence is granted for the living, the same uncertainty exists for the same object. For if the Church taught that an indulgence really, instead of nominally, remitted the temporal punishment, this, of course, would imply that a person thus pardoned had no longer the temporal punishment to endure, and whoever died certain of this would, of course, as certainly escape Purgatory, and if they certainly escaped Purgatory, there would be no necessity for masses, and then, as there would be no *pater noster* required, there would be no pay required ; and hence we arrive at the reason why the Church teaches that an indulgence cannot be trusted, and that it is “ a fatal delusion ” to trust it. And this is the way that Roman Catholics are *indulged* out of the spiritual treasury of the Church : the stock disposed of is to be still retained, and the satisfaction forgiven is still to be made. According, then, to the last explanations of our little book, we are obliged to answer the question, “ What is an indulgence ? ” by this reply, “ An indulgence is the total or partial remission of the temporal punishment or penance due to sin ; in such sort, that after the penances have been nominally pardoned, they have to be really endured.”

As regards the remission of the temporal punishment, we have now fairly seen that an indulgence is a “ pious fraud,” which could only exist in a Church lost to all shame. But as there are numerous other uses to which this grant has been applied besides the canonical one of remitting—that is, of *retaining*—penances, we have still further answers to give to the question, “ What is an indulgence ? ” We shall take one specimen of these uses from our little book, and then a few from some other sources. It says that during a jubilee, which is a wholesale plenary indulgence—“ The Holy See gives to approved confessors . . . the faculty of *commuting vows* ; ” that is, liberty to break vows and oaths, as we learn from many such indulgences on record,

and one of which we supply for example. This is a specimen granted by the Pope, Clement VI., in the year 1351, to the king and queen of France :—

“ We, by apostolic authority, and by the tenor of these presents, do *for ever* (a ‘ perpetual indulgence ’) grant indulgence to you and *your successors*, . . . that the religious or secular confessor . . . may commute for you and them such *vows* as, perhaps, you may have already made, or which may hereafter be made by you or your successors, and also such *oaths* by you taken, or by you and them hereafter to be taken, which you and they *cannot commodiously keep*, into such other works of piety (!) as he shall see expedient for the health of your and their souls (!), and according to God (!).”—Dacher *Spicelig*. Edition 1723, vol. iii. p. 724.

Roman Catholics make a great pother about Luther’s breaking an unlawful vow when he married, but the Pope, you see, can not only bind his followers with unlawful vows, but liberate them from true ones. Hence “ an indulgence, in this capacity, is a licence to violate such vows and oaths as we ‘ cannot commodiously ’ keep, or to accomplish the sinless commission of perfidy and perjury.”

Leaving our little book, we proceed to consult another little book, called “ The Forty Hours’ Adoration,” by Dr Cullen, (Duffy, Wellington Quay, Dublin, 1852.) This little book contains various references to the use of indulgences. Here is one : “ The indulgence of the Crusades was granted to encourage the attempts made by the Christian princes to protect and liberate the holy places from the tyranny and oppression of the unbelievers ; ” that is, of the Mohammedans or Turks who have them still, and doubtless will have them until better opponents come to the rescue. Every one knows the barbarous history of the bloody Crusades, but many Roman Catholics may not be aware that the slaughter of the butchered millions was religiously accomplished by a Pope’s commission under the name of an indulgence. Mohammed had guaranteed an instantaneous entrance into paradise to all who died fighting for his faith ; and the Pope, to compete with Mohammed’s indul-

gence, granted a plenary exemption from Purgatory to all who died fighting for his faith. Hence, in answer to our question, we may further reply that "an indulgence is a Papal commission to massacre those of a different creed who may have possessions or territory, the capture of which would enlarge the dominion and increase the proceeds of the Holy See."

Again, Dr Cullen, in enumerating the virtues of indulgences, says : "The so much misrepresented indulgences *preached* for the building of the magnificent temple under the invocation of St Peter in Rome, had, apart from the much exaggerated abuses of subordinate agents, a wise, a noble, and a *holy* object." Dr Cullen would try to cover the pontifical squanderer and profligate Leo X., by laying his villanies at the door of his "subordinate agents." Here is the Pope's commission given to one of these agents, Tetzel, for the "wise, noble, and holy object" :—"May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of His most holy passion ; and I by His authority, that of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy father, the Pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they may have been incurred, and then from *all thy sins*, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be. . . . And I restore you to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism ; so that, when you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delight shall be opened ; and if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when you are at the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The brother, John Tetzel, hath signed this (indulgence) with his own hand.—*Sechend.* Comment. book i. p. 14.

Here is part of the complaint of the German Roman Catholic princes in reference to the benefits of this and the similar indulgences of "the subordinate agents"—

We complain "of the increase of the intolerable burden

of indulgences, when, under show of piety for building churches, or an expedition against the Turks, the Pope sucks the marrow of our estates, . . . while, to advance their market, they extol their wares for granting of wonderful, unheard-of, positive pardons, not only of sins already committed, but of sins to be committed."—Priest Dupin's *History of the Church*, vol. iii. p. 182. Dublin Edition, 1723.

Since Protestants have reformed the Church of Rome, indulgences have become lessened in their virtues; they *now* remit only "temporal punishment," but in those palmy days of the Church, an indulgence sold as a universal nostrum for sin. Who was it thus "exaggerated their abuses?"—a squandering and profligate Pope, to build and garnish a theatrical chapel. Hence, an indulgence in this case is properly defined: "A universal pardon, sold by subordinate agents, for cash to pay off the Pope's architects, builders, masons, carpenters, painters, and gilders, when he has a chapel or a palace to build."

From the preceding inquiry into the character of this article, we think our Roman Catholic friends must be satisfied as to the value of the benefits proposed to them by an indulgence; and were we now to ask them, by way of examination on the instructions given, "What is an indulgence?" we are assured, if they are honest and sensible men, they will answer that "an indulgence is a foul scheme to rob God of His glory, men of their salvation, religion of its respect, and fools of their money." You may say that indulgences are *now* disposed of gratuitously, at least in these countries. This, like the indulgence, is "a fatal delusion." Although they are not now brought into the public market in a scrip, and sold by such agents as Tetzels, yet the proceeds are as securely obtained by chapel visits and the *consequent collections*. Every indulgence granted requires the *sine qua non* of so many chapels visited; and your wax candles and nosegays are simply required to please your senses, in order to despoil your pockets the more agreeably.

My dear friends, flee from the foolery which has made

your religion the scorn of human intellect—the laughing-stock even of many of yourselves. Take up the book of God, and by its contents examine the contents of the fanciful treasury out of which you are to receive the imaginary remission of temporal punishment. Learn there that no saint has merit for himself, much less merit to spare—that Christ told even an apostle to count himself, after having done all he was commanded, an “unprofitable servant,” (Luke xvii. 10 ;) that even the “righteous shall scarcely be saved,” (1 Pet. iv. 18 ;) that nevertheless “there is *no condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus,” (Rom. viii. 1 ;) “the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from *all sin*,” (1 John i. 7 ;) and if you will not follow the advice of the Book of God, take that of your own little book, which tells you that to trust in an indulgence is “a fatal delusion.”

In the preceding observations the Popish doctrine of indulgence is seen to be overwhelmed by its own absurdities. It needs no appeal to Scripture to further expose so gross an outrage upon the precious doctrine of a full, free, and *unmerited* justification through faith. In the Scripture system, instead of possessing a surplus of merit to bestow upon others, no saint has merit enough, or rather has any merit at all. The Popish works, which are the alleged source of merit, are either the fruit of grace, or they are not. If they are the fruit of grace, then God is the meriter, and not the saint ; and if they are not the fruit of grace, then they are not acceptable with God at all. He “works in us both to will and to do of His own good pleasure.” And what He works *in* us He has a right to receive *from* us ; so that instead of involving God in any obligation to requite us, the more good works we perform the more we are indebted to His grace, and the more our obligations to God are increased !

Development of Indulgences.

As already seen, the doctrine of indulgences embraces two distinct modes of applying the Pope's grace to the subjects of his salvation ; the one, as he says himself, by

“the method of absolution,” the other by “the method of suffrage,” or masses. The distinction implies the difference between the application of an indulgence to the living and to the dead ; or between penitential and purgatorial indulgence. As these two classes of indulgences were developed at different periods, and from different causes, the development of each is separately noticed here.

Development of Penitential Indulgences.

Penitential Indulgence being an appendage of the sacrament of penance developed in a *pari passu* fashion with the sacrament itself. The history of indulgences is marked by three very distinct stages, which may be called the Ecclesiastical, Episcopal, and Papal eras of the doctrine.

Ecclesiastical Indulgences, as already intimated, had their origin in a very early discipline of ecclesiastical bodies. Even in the apostles' days *public* sinners were expelled from church fellowships until they had *publicly* confessed, and exhibited contrition for their sin, when they received *public* absolution, and were again re-admitted to the privileges of church communion. The whole of this disciplinary procedure is easily gathered from the case of the incestuous Corinthian—1 Cor. v., compared with 2 Cor. ii. 6-10.

That the pardon here referred to was granted by the whole congregation, is admitted by Cardinal Wiseman, who, with singular suicidal logic, quotes the case to prove the indulgences granted by the *Pope* ! The sincerity of the confession thus imposed on notorious transgressors soon became liable to suspicion from their relapses into similar or other sins. Hence, after the apostolic age, churches came to impose various forms of disciplinary punishments, called ecclesiastical or canonical penances, the voluntary acceptance and endurance of which was supposed to offer a species of guarantee for the security of the penitent's verbally expressed repentance. When, however, the evidence was given by other marks, and before they had fulfilled their imposed penalties, penitents were condoned or pardoned, and this remission of the ecclesias-

tical or canonical penances constitutes *the earliest form of indulgence*. The name indulgence, however, did not come to be applied to the pardon of ecclesiastical censures and canonical penances until this discipline came to be developed in the second stage, or—

Episcopal indulgence.—Gregory I., in the sixth century, transformed the whole procedure of the public discipline which has just been detailed into a *private* transaction between the priest and the penitent, a change which ultimately developed into the present so-called sacrament of of penance, (see Mosheim, century 6.) With this change the bishop, or the official that acted for the congregation in the administration of ecclesiastical penance, now began to exercise this function in an independent manner ; so that he indulged or remitted penances imposed by the priest in the confessional without any regard to the will of the congregation in the case. By this usurpation of congregational power Ecclesiastical was converted into Episcopal indulgence.

The bishops continued to be the independent source of indulgence from penance for many ages, and as a consequence they converted this source of superstition into a source of wealth and influence which rivalled every other means of enriching the Church. The first step towards this development of indulgences was the practice of exchanging canonical penalties for an equivalent in the shape of “good works ;” meaning by the latter term the fulfilment of extra *positive*, instead of penal duties, to be defined in the terms of the indulgence. In this way an indulgence came to mean an instrument which granted to the penitent a release from certain *penalties* for fulfilling certain *precepts*. The precepts chiefly imposed were those which related to what are called, in the Popish phrase, “works of charity,” and among the chief of these were *money payments* for such objects as the priests wished to accomplish at the expense of the laity.

“In all cases the person (that is, the bishop) granting the relaxation (of an indulgence) was to impose certain good works as a partial substitute for the penalty which had been relaxed, and among these

works, which had at first been purely personal, came by degrees to be included *money payments* for certain religious or charitable objects, as the building of a church, or the foundation of a monastery or hospital.”—*Chambers’s Encyclopædia for the People, in loco.*

Papal Indulgences.—Such an enormous amount of treasure and power came to be acquired by the bishops as to attract the notice and excite the rival cupidity and ambition of the Popes. The latter, therefore, began to lay their accounts to restrict the power of granting indulgences to the “chair of Peter.” This exclusive power to grant indulgences was, according to ecclesiastical history, at least partially realised by the Popes about the beginning of the twelfth century. To enhance the value of the article thus monopolised, the Popes extended the efficacy of indulgences to the relief or release of souls in Purgatory, thus originating the

Development of Purgatorial Indulgences.

“The Roman Pontiffs, perceiving what advantages the inferior bishops derived from their indulgences, concluded that the power of the bishops to remit ecclesiastical penalties ought to be circumscribed, and the prerogative be almost wholly transferred to the Holy See. Accordingly they began, as the necessities or convenience of the Church, or their own interests required, to publish, not merely the common and ordinary, but likewise the entire and absolute, or the plenary remission of all finite or temporal penalties; and they cancelled not only the punishments which the canons and human tribunals inflicted, *but also those to be endured after death, which the bishops had never attempted to set aside.*”—*Mosheim*, p. 417.

The extension of the power of indulgences to the sphere of Purgatory met with such controversial opposition that the Pope was obliged to employ his ablest theological craftsmen to fabricate some theory which should supply argument to support the novel innovation. The theory devised embraced the

Development of the Extraordinary Fiction called The Bank or Treasury of Indulgences.

“Upon the introduction of the new policy the ancient system of canonical and ecclesiastical penances was wholly subverted; and the books of canons and the penitentials (or the scale and regula-

tions of canonical penances) being laid aside, transgressors were no longer under restraints. To support this proceeding of the Pontiffs an unheard-of doctrine was devised in this century, and improved and polished in the following century, by St Thomas ; namely, that there is *an immense treasury of good works which holy men have performed over and above what duty required* ; and that the Roman Pontiff is the keeper and distributor of this treasure, so that he is able, out of this inexhaustible fund, to give and transfer to every one such an amount of good works as his necessities require, or as will suffice to avert the punishment of his sins. This miserable and pernicious fiction, it is to be lamented, is still retained and defended.”—*Mosheim*, pp. 417, 418.

It is scarcely necessary to make any argumentative reference to this whimsical coinage of the Pope’s brain. However ingenious the fancy, it offers no solution to the difficulties which beset the Pope’s professed power to pardon sinners in the region of Purgatory—difficulties which originate out of the very Scriptures which the Pope advances in support of his power. His favourite text says, “Whatsoever thou shalt bind *on earth* shall be bound in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose *on earth* shall be loosed in heaven,” (Matt. xvi. 19.) Surely a text so plainly restricting the exercise of this commission “*to earth*,” can never be explained to extend to Purgatory, even with all the help supplied by the imaginary treasury from which the Pope professes to draw the grace of indulgence.

The Popes assumed the exclusive power of granting indulgences professedly to rectify the abuses which crept into the Church by the Episcopal management of this ordinance. One would have supposed, therefore, that when the pontiffs came to exercise an exclusive control over “the treasury of the Church,” all abuses in the management of its funds would begin to disappear, instead of becoming infinitely aggravated. The Pope not only continued to indulge or commute penances for “money payments,” but employed his indulging power to create and promote the most fanatical and bloody wars in support of his ambitious project to grasp universal authority, and especially to promote the interests of the Church by the extirpation of heresy. Romanists, in endeavouring to palliate such crimes, call that an abuse of the doctrine

which is really the doctrine itself. Thus, if it is the doctrine in this case that the Pope has been made by Christ the sole patentee and uncontrolled disposer of indulgences, has he not a right "to do what he likes with his own?" and why call that an abuse which properly constitutes the normal use of his power?

The earliest, most marked and prominent service to which the Pope applied his newly-acquired power of indulgences, was the promotion of the Crusades, originated under the auspices of Urban II. about the beginning of the twelfth century. He proclaimed a *full pardon for sin* to all who would join the banner of the cross:—

"We, trusting in the mercy of God, and the authority of St Peter and St Paul, to all Christians who take up arms, &c., *relax infinite penances for their misdeeds*. But let those who shall die there, or in battle, and true repentance, not doubt that they will have pardon of their sins, and the fruit of eternal reward."—*Mansi*. v. xx., c. 283.

These indulgences were followed by others of the most extravagant liberality, so that by the influence of such spiritual stimulants an innumerable host of morally deranged wretches enlisted themselves in the service of the Pope to prosecute a series of the most Quixotic enterprises ever engaged in by humanity. The Pope's indulgences, however spiritually beneficial, not only proved totally inefficacious as regards the temporal success of these enterprises, but were actually the cause of all the malfortune and curse which characterised the Crusades. The brutally ignorant host, confiding in the benefit of the Pope's pardon for all sins, gave themselves up to the most unbounded profligacy. This profligacy ultimately so demoralised and disorganised the bands of pilgrim soldiers, that no discipline could reduce them to order, and no commander could control, much less lead them to victory.

"The first division, in their march through Hungary and Thrace, *committed the most flagitious crimes*, which so incensed the inhabitants of these countries through which they passed, particularly those of Hungary and Turcomania, that they rose up in arms and massacred the greatest part of them. A like fate attended several

other divisions of the same army, who, under the conduct of weak and unskilful chiefs, wandered about like an undisciplined band of robbers, plundering the cities that lay in their way, and spreading misery and desolation wherever they came."—*Mosheim*, vol. i. p. 232, M'Laine's translation.

The Pope (Innocent III.) next tried "the power of indulgence left by Christ in the Church" in a new series of crusades against a new class of alleged heretics—the Waldenses; so that, according to the use made of it, "the power of indulgence" was the power to assassinate and extirpate, by fagot and sword, all who dared to dissent from the creed which the Pope was pleased to dictate for the belief of humanity. The Pope's enterprise in the Albigensian crusade was confessedly successful for a time; it verified those Scripture prophecies which point to Rome as the slaughterhouse of the saints.

In the thirteenth century, a new development grew out of indulgences which infinitely enhanced their value, not to the receivers, but to the granters. This was the

Development of Jubilees, or Jubilistic Indulgences.

Boniface VIII. finding that indulgences became such a fruitful source of revenue, conceived that if he could bring the buyers of the article to the city of Rome, the Papal exchequer would be more directly and effectually benefited. To create a theological basis for the new development, it occurred to the imagination of the Pope, that as the year of jubilee in the Jewish dispensation was accompanied with the remission of all *temporal debts*, a similar institution was wanted in the New Testament dispensation, which should include the remission of all *spiritual debts* by "the grace of indulgences," to be dispensed exclusively in the city of Rome. To give the innovation acceptance with the multitude, a *tradition* was devised to support the Pope's project, which took its practical origin according to the following account in the words of the Romish Bishop Bouvier:—

"Towards the close of the year 1299, it was reported that in Rome all who should visit the churches of St Peter and St Paul would gain a *great indulgence*. On the 1st of January of the ensuing year, a crowd of people flocked as by inspiration to the church

of St Peter. An Italian, who had attained his one hundred and seventh year, was conducted to Boniface VIII., and told that Pontiff that his father had specially commanded him to visit Rome in the year 1300, if alive, and to visit the church of St Peter, in order to gain the plenary indulgence, as he himself had gained it in the year 1200. Several other Italians, and two aged men from the diocese of Bouvais, in France, confirmed this oral tradition."

Bishop Bouvier then goes on to relate that Boniface, acting on the dictate of such an undoubted tradition, issued a bull for the observance of a jubilee to be observed at Rome in the year 1300, and to be accompanied by a grant of a plenary indulgence to all who, being sincerely sorry for their sins, faithfully confessed them, and visited the churches of St Peter and St Paul thirty days successively, if inhabitants of Rome, or fifteen days successively, if strangers. The Bishop relates the success of this first jubilee in these words :—

"The conflux of pilgrims was so great, that during the whole of the year there were on the average two hundred thousand strangers in Rome; nevertheless, there never was any want of provisions, which was looked upon as a miracle."

The Bishop then goes on to relate that the successors of Boniface, while they retained his institution, rejected its periodicity of one hundred years, which was first reduced to fifty years, then to thirty-three, next to twenty-five years. Lastly, under the name of "extraordinary jubilees," the Popes found means to publish a jubilee every time they felt specially in want of money.

The natural consequence of this multiplication of jubilees was to diminish their influence, and pilgrimages to Rome fell off just in proportion as the Popes increased the frequency of the privilege. The Popes therefore were obliged to dispense with the necessity of coming to Rome to receive the benefit of his jubilistic indulgences, but he still made arrangement that this exemption should not be accompanied by any corresponding exemption from the *cash payments* necessary to receive the benefits he conferred in Rome. The introduction of this new change is thus related by Bouvier :—

"After the jubilee at Rome in 1450, Nicholas V. granted in the

following year to the Poles the jubilee indulgence, and dispensed with the journey to Rome *on condition of their giving, by way of alms, half the expense they would have incurred by the journey to and from Rome to defray the costs of the war against the Turks.*"—*Treatise on Indulgences*, p. 266.

Towards the close of the fifteenth century, the utmost efforts of the Popes were insufficient to sustain the credit of indulgences. The more the sale of these wares fell, the more the Pope was driven to make extravagant efforts for the revival of his traffic. At the period referred to, he farmed out commissions to sell indulgences by numerous foreign agents. The success of these agents did not satisfy the craving demands of Leo X., whose fate it was to put his hand to the last development of the most gigantic and blasphemous swindle ever devised, even by the cupidity of Popery. This leads to a passing reference to the

Connexion of Indulgences with the Reformation.

The connexion of indulgences with the origin and success of the Reformation has given this doctrine an historical and memorable prominence, which makes the subject of indulgence one of peculiar interest in the study of Popery. Leo X. wished to immortalise his name by the erection or completion of the vast cathedral dedicated to St Peter at Rome. To raise the immense sums required for this undertaking, he made the desperate effort to dispose of indulgences which providentially proved the occasion of the Reformation. It is rather remarkable that the Pope's desperate effort to construct the *material temple* of Rome, should have produced the movement which is ultimately destined to destroy the *spiritual edifice* of the Papacy.

Congregation of Indulgences.

The Council of Trent saw that, as the doctrine of indulgences was the immediate origin and strength of the Reformation, it was specially necessary to try and ameliorate the scandalous practices which had wellnigh proved the destruction of Popery. Hence, since the sitting of the

Council, or rather since the Reformation, Rome has become more circumspect in relation to the disposal of indulgences. The congregation of indulgences is but one of a number of corporations which the Pope has erected in Rome to facilitate the exercise of supremacy. It manages all affairs connected with this department of the Papal exchequer. A glimpse at the nature of the business transacted by this congregation will be obtained by the subjoined quotation from the interesting work of Dr De Sanctis, "Popery and Jesuitism at Rome":—

"By this time Signor Pasquali returned, and begged that the priest would take us to see the congregations which assist the Pope in the exercise of his supremacy. Having given some orders to the sacristan, he went with us."

"We at once proceeded to the *Office of Indulgences*. In the first room we entered a man was occupied in stamping the occasion of their grant on rescripts of indulgence. The walls of the second were loaded with shelves, piled with the originals of former grants; then there were four tables, occupied by four priests, three of whom were employed in making out rescripts, and the fourth in distributing them to those by whom they had been requested, and in *taking their money*. We passed on to the third room, where was a minor prelate, the vice-secretary, a friend of our priest's. He received us with great politeness, and on hearing that we were foreigners, courteously described to us the routine of the office. He told us that the sacred congregation is composed of several cardinals, but only for form's sake; and that there is also a secretary-prelate, who, however, takes no interest in the proceedings, which are all conducted by his substitute, and other subordinate priests, by whom indulgences are granted, altars privileged, and the right of consecrating garlands, crucifixes, and medals dispensed, as well as a hundred similar immunities to those who want them. I begged to know what a privileged altar meant; and he, smiling at my ignorance, told me that it signified an altar where the performance of a mass was effectual to liberate from Purgatory the soul for whom it was said. 'Privileged altars,' he continued, 'are of two kinds, real and personal; the real are those in which the privilege is annexed to the altar; the personal, those in which the privilege is annexed to the person saying mass, so that every time a priest who has an altar *personally* privileged says mass, he may free a soul from Purgatory.'

"Signor Pasquali then asked what was the official method of granting an indulgence. The vice-secretary replied, 'The office makes no difficulty of according any which the petitioner requires

for himself and his own family, or which appear to be of a private nature. In regard to those which are of a public character, I apply to his Holiness. Such as are desired in perpetuity, or bring *great benefit to the Church*, or to the person to whom they are granted, are obtained by a rescript, obtained at this office in the first instance, but which then must be forwarded to the Brief Office, and *a considerable sum paid on it, according to the amount of the privilege.*'

"Signor Pasquali remarked, that an indulgence being a spiritual thing, it seemed to him simony to sell it. 'No doubt,' replied the vice-secretary, 'to sell indulgences would be simony. God preserve us from such an idea! Protestants falsely accuse the Church of selling everything. In the first place, indulgences are not sold, they are granted gratis; what is paid for is not the indulgence itself, but the *title* and the *ink*,—and as these are material things, we may buy and sell them in all good conscience.'

—Pp. 85–87.

Social and Political Relations of Indulgences.

Romanism, as studied in its books of theology, is one thing—as studied in the page of history and fact, is another. Even in the former sense the doctrine of indulgences is such as must, antecedent to all experience, be a source of vast social and political evil. As before seen, it belongs to the theology of an indulgence that it remits or removes no *sin*—that it simply liberates from the penalty of sin. Is not this what the Romanist and all depraved humanity want? To keep his sin, and be delivered from its penalties, is precisely what the Romanist desires, and what has been the chief source of all the social immorality which has attended the crown and flower of the Popes' debasing theology. Of course the theology *professes* to grant indulgences only to such as are penitent, but experience teaches that indulgences operate on the majority of Papists simply as a permission to sin.

The theological condition of an indulgence is the performance of some positive duties called works; but the historical conditions have generally been to perpetrate some of the most outrageous social and political crimes—such as the conditions required of the Waldensian and Turkish crusaders, and in the numerous similar enterprises of the Papacy associated with the history of the United Kingdom. The Pope finds it his interest at *present* to

withhold indulgence from his Fenian subjects in Ireland. But that the Pope's anti-Fenian policy is one of expediency, is evident from the history of those times when he was free to act out his principles. A few extracts will be serviceable to explain the Pope's real principles in relation to Fenianism, or the hostility of Irish Romanists to British connexion.

Plenary Indulgence of Irish Fenianism.

Pope Gregory XIV. granted a plenary indulgence to all Irish Fenians or rebels who should embark in a crusade to dethrone Elizabeth, under his emissary General Geraldine.

"And that you may do this work with greater alacrity, we grant to all and singular of you, who being contrite and confessing, or having the purpose of confessing, (how accommodating!) shall follow the said general, or shall forward his holy purpose by council, arms, provisions, or any other means . . . a *plenary indulgence* and remission of all their sins, according to the form which is accustomed to be used for those who war against the Turks for the recovery of the Holy Land."—*Evidence of his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, Lords' Report*, p. 776.

Another specimen of the same *war-form* of indulgence is supplied by the bulls of Clement VIII. Clement had "indulged" Hugh O'Neil, the Irish rebel, to continue the war against Queen Elizabeth. The Pope's letter to Hugh not being perfectly satisfactory to some parties inclining to loyalty, queries were drawn up and addressed to the universities of Salamanca and Valladolid, requesting them to supply an interpretation of the Pope's bull to O'Neil.

"*Answer.* In order to solve these questions, it must, in the first place, be laid down as *certain*, that the Roman Pontiff may coerce and punish apostates from the faith and impugnors of the Catholic religion, even by force of arms, when other means fail to correct so great an enormity, &c. These matters being premised . . .

"The first question is easily answered. It is beyond doubt that the said Catholics may assist said prince with great merit and assured hope of eternal reward. For as said prince makes war for religion by the authority and exhortation of the Roman Pontiff, and as *indulgences and graces* are granted for engaging in it, there can be no question that the war is just, and of great merit.

"Touching the second question, it is also certain that those

Catholics do sin mortally who follow the camp of the English against said prince, and that they cannot be absolved by any priest until they repent and desert from the English army. The same judgment is to be passed on all who supply the English with arms or provisions, or with anything beyond those customary taxes which, by *the indult and permission of the Pope*, it is lawful to pay the Queen of England or her officers. It is permitted to the Catholics to pay to the heretical queen that kind and degree of allegiance which may not injure the Catholic religion. But it is not, neither could it be, the intention of the Pontiff to allow them to perform such acts of allegiance as would be plainly inconsistent with the end and purpose *which the Pontiff himself has in view* for the advancement of the Catholic faith and religion in Ireland."

These documents, which are of special importance in the study of political Popery, together with the bulls to which they refer, may be found by Roman Catholics in Priest Geoghegan's "History of Ireland." It is very interesting to compare the answers given by the two Spanish universities on this occasion, with the answers given by the same universities to Prime Minister Pitt, in reply to questions which he put preparatory to the endowment of Maynooth College. Those acquainted with the history of the Maynooth endowment know how the answers in the latter case totally outwitted the greatest of British statesmen.

The bull of Urban VIII., dated 25th May 1643, to revive the fallen courage of the Irish Fenians of that period, supplies a few more extracts.

"Having taken into consideration the zeal of the Irish towards propagating the Catholic faith, and the piety of Catholic warriors in the several armies of that kingdom . . . and having got certain notice how, in imitation of their godly and worthy ancestors, they endeavoured by force of arms to deliver their enthralled nation from the oppression and grievous injury of the heretics . . . and gallantly do what in them lieth to extirpate and wholly root out those workers of iniquity, who, in the kingdom of Ireland, had infected, and always striven to infect, the mass of the Catholic purity with the pestiferous leaven of their heretical contagion . . . to all and every one of the faithful Christians in the aforesaid kingdom of Ireland, and now for the time militating against the heretics . . . we do grant full and plenary indulgence and absolute remission of all their sins."

That the recollection of these indulgences have been

fruitful in reviving present day Fenianism, is evident, unless we suppose Roman Catholics have ceased to put trust in the Pope's power, or to be able to interpret his meaning, even when he speaks contrary to what he wills. When he had the power, and when the heretic was tried, condemned, and delivered up to the "secular arm" by the Inquisition, "the recommendation to mercy" pronounced by the latter was always intended to signify that the heretic was to be burned alive. Is it not equally true that, while the Pope pipes peace with his lips, the Irish Papist knows that the tune piped is "death to the heretic?" In the political relations between England and Ireland the Papacy has proved a double curse to the latter country,—a fact that may be historically illustrated in a few sentences. Before the Reformation, Ireland was relatively Protestant, or independent of the Papacy, while England was totally Popish. Hence the Papacy employed the English sword of Henry II. to coerce the Irish into subjection to English Popery, and *succeeded*. After the Reformation, England became Protestant, and Ireland remained Popish. Hence the Papacy has never since desisted in its efforts to separate Popish Ireland from Protestant England.

It must be confessed that the political power, as well as the monetary value, of indulgences has fallen before the present day progress of mind. The Pope can no longer by an indulgence pardon sins, on condition of committing greater crimes; he can no longer employ an indulgence as a military instrument, capable of stimulating an army of blood-thirsty fanatics to the accomplishment of the most ferocious assassinations which have ever blackened the page of history. Nor is the marketable value of this spiritual commodity sufficient to fill the coffers of the Church, as it was wont in times of less light. Hence the Pope in these latter times has become largely liberal in bestowing for nothing what he finds he cannot dispose of for cash, and almost every week we hear of indulgences being gratuitously dispensed by his Holiness for such easily fulfilled conditions as "a prayer for the conversion of England," or the "preservation of the Holy See."

With the considerable amelioration which has thus been forced on the Pope, it is no harm to express a desire for further improvement, or to pray that the Pope may yet be induced to "indulge" his flock with the gospel of Christ, with civil liberty, and all those other privileges with which, as we know from the Scriptures, Christ has indulged His people, and more especially the poor of His flock.

THE END.

I N D E X.

A

- ABSOLUTION before Crime, 134
Reserved, Examples of, 153
Sacramental, 111, *et seq.*, 151
ADULTERATION of Scriptures, see "Scriptures"
AGGRESSION, Papal, 22, 39
AIKMAN on Wolsey's Suppression of Monasteries, 284
ANGEL Worship, 339
ANTONY the Hermit, 236
APOSTASY, Rome the Foretold, 209
APOSTLES never Judicially Absolved any from Sin, 113
APOSTOLICAL Traditions, 56
APOSTOLICITY of Romish Orders, 197, 214
AUTHORITY of the Church, Rome's Fundamental Dogma, 55
Of Magistrate in Religion, 34, *et seq.*

B

- BAILLY on the Penal Obligations of Baptised Heretics, 97
On Venial Theft, 104
BAMBINO, Worship of, in Italy, 380
BAPTISM, Compulsory, 97
Heretical, Homologated by Rome, 84
Priestly Intention in, 88
Romish, 93, 302
BAPTISMAL Errors of Early Church, 66
Obligations, 95
BARROW on the Evils of Co-ordination, 32
BARROW'S Thirty-six Causes of Popish Political Development, 44
BASIL of Cæsarea, Originated Monkish Orders, 237
BASIS of Political Popery, 48
BEGG, Dr., on Popish Deathbed Plunder, 194
On Jesuits in Edinburgh, 276
BEGGARY a Popish Virtue, 216, 219, *et seq.*

- BELLARMINE, on Intention, 90
 On Purgatory, 325
- BENEDICT, Saint, his Order of Monks, 215, 238
- BENEDICT XIV. on the Compulsory Baptism of Jews, 98
- BIBLE, see "Scriptures"
- BISHOP BROWN Asserts Tradition and Development to be the same thing, 65
- BISHOPS, Popish, Freebooters in Feudal Times, 240
 To be Honoured before the King, 57
- BLACKSTONE on Evidence Quoted, 70
- BLANCHI on Espionage of the Confessional, 146
- BLASPHEMY Defined, from *National Encyclopædia*, 183
 Transubstantiation a, 183
- BONIFACE VIII. on the Supremacy of the Church over the State, 37
- BOREL on term Nun, 229
- BOUVIER on Indulgences, 387, *et seq.*
 On Jubilees, 408
- BREVIARY, The, on Paul the Hermit, 235
 On St Antony, 236
- BRITAIN, Confessional Progress in, 130
- BUCK on Romish Relics in England, 366
- BULL, *Sollicitudo Omnium*, Restoring Jesuits, 271
 Of Papal Aggression, 39
 Suppressing Jesuits, 273
- BULLS of Pope against the Scriptures, 81
- BULWARK, The, on Deathbed Absolution, 153
- BURNET on Blasphemous Popish Picture of the Host, 184
- BURNETT on the Evil Influence of Priestly Absolution on Criminals, 134

C

- CALMET on Early Deaconesses, 231
- CALVIN on Relics, 356, 361
- CANON Law above the Civil, 39
- CANONISATION of Saints, 337
 Cost of, 349
 Development of, 343
 Process of, 346, *et seq.*
- CANONS, Regular and Secular, 215
- CATECHISM of Trent on the Quasi-matter of Penance, 111
- CAUSES of Development of Political Popery, 43
- CELIBACY a Social and Political Evil, 281
 Institution of, 206

- CELIBACY, Policy of, to Reduce the Priesthood to Absolute Popish
 Vassalage, 211
 The Saviour and Paul on, 207
 Trent on, 207
 CHAINS of Paul, 358
 Of Peter at Rome, 364
 CHAMBERS'S ENCYCLOPÆDIA on Jesuits, 254
 CHANGEABLE Nature of Popery, 1
 CHASTITY, Council of Trent on, 217
 Vow of, 217
 CHINESE and the Jesuits, 265, 267
 CHRIST Man's only Intercessor before God in Heaven, 340
 CHRIST'S Kingly Office in Church and State, how Exercised, 29, 30
 CHURCH, Meaning of, 198
 CHURCH of ENGLAND, Ritual Popery in, 300
 CHURCH REVIEW on Henry VIII., 335
 CHURCH and State cannot have Co-ordinate Jurisdiction, 31
 Relations of, 26
 CHURCH Authority, Rome's Fundamental Tenet, 55
 CHURCH or Priest the Papist's Rule, 70, 74
 CIRCUMSTANTIAL Causes of Popish Political Development, 43
 CIVIL Government, 25
 Obligations of Confessional in Papal States, 147
 Popery, 40
 CLASS Instruction on Popery, 1, 12
 CLEMENT VIII. gives Indulgence to Irish Fenians, 413
 COADJUTORS, Jesuit, 249
 COBBETT on the Beastly Crimes of the Monks, 288
 On the Papal Absolution of "Bloody Mary's" Parliament
 and the Nation, 154
 COLLISIONS between Confessional and Civil Law, 132
 COMPULSORY Baptism, 97
 Confession, 127
 COMMUNION in One Kind, 177
 COMPARATIVE Influence of Popery and Protestantism, 19
 CONFESSIONAL, The, 114
 And Civil Law, 132
 An Instrument of Papal Espionage, 145, *et seq.*
 A Source of the "Social Evil," 119
 Canon on, 131
 Directorship of, 143
 How States should Treat it, 166
 In Papal States, 147, *et seq.*
 In the Church of England, 131

- CONFESSIONAL, in the Present Day History of the Papacy, 159
 Intercourse of Priest and Penitent in, 118
 Liguori on, 136
 Obligations of, 127
 Penitent in, 117
 Political Applications of, 144
 Progress in Britain of, 130
 Publications, Suppression of, 169
 Seal of, 123
 Suppression of, 168
 Training of Priest for, 116
 CONFESSOR, The King's, 149
 CONFIRMATION, Political Relations of, 170
 A Ratification of Baptism, 171
 Requires Sponsors, who are thereby made Relatives, 172
 CONGREGATION of the Index, 75
 Of Indulgences, 410
 Of Relics, 361
 CONGREGATIONAL Monks, 236
 CORPOREAL Penalties may be Inflicted by Pope, 57
 CORPUS Christi Festival, 310
 CONSEQUENCES of "Intention," 90
 CONSTANCE KENT and the Confessional, 142
 CONSTANTINE'S Gift to the Papacy a Forgery, 59
 CONSTANTINOPLE, Third Council of, Established Image Wor-
 ship, 379
 Second Council of, Condemned Image Worship, 379
 CONSTITUTION of Jesuits, 247, *et seq.*, 254
 Of Popery, Political, 20
 CONTROL of Scriptures Claimed by Rome, 68
 CONTROVERSY Necessary and Beneficial, 15
 COUNSELS of Perfection, 214, *et seq.*
 CRAMP on Indulgences, 384
 CREED of Pius IV., 49
 At Rome, 315
 Might be termed the *Powers* of Pope Pius IV., 50
 The Instrument of Superstition, 53
 CROSS, Wood of the, 359
 CRUSADE, Indulgences to Promote, 399, 407
 CULLEN on Indulgences, 399

D

- DAILY NEWS on Deathbed Plunder of the Priesthood, 194
 DAILY REVIEW on M'Laughlan's Confessional Case, 137

- DEACONESSES in early Church, 230
- DEATHBED Power of Purgatory, 334
- DECLINE of Popery in Popish States, 21
Of Protestantism in Britain and Protestant States, 22
- DECLARATION against Transubstantiation, 183
- DECRETALS of Isidore, Falsehood of, 62
- DELAHOGUE on Seal of Confessional, 124
On the Penal Obligations of Baptised Heretics, 97
- DENOMINATIONAL Monkeny, 237
- DENS, on Seal of Confessional, 123
On Confessional Directorship, 144
- DE SANCTIS, on Jesuitism in England, 277
On Relic-Rooms at Rome, 363
On Roman Office of Indulgences, 411
- DE THOU on the Jesuits, 270
- DEVELOPMENT, Historical, of Popery, 5
Of a Sacrificing Priesthood, 180
And Tradition, 64
As Expounded by *Home and Foreign Review*, 3
Of Canonisation, 343
Of Extreme Unction, 189
Of Fasting Communion, 178
Of Half-Communion, 177
Of Host Worship, 179
Of Indulgences, 402
Of Infidelity from Transubstantiation, 180
Of Jubilees, 408
Of Monasticism, 232
Of Penitential Indulgences, 403
Of Penitential System, 157
Of Political Popery, 7, 41, 43
Of Popery, Fourfold, 5
Of Popish Dogmas, 4
Of Popish Justification, 304
Of Popish Orders, 198
Of Purgatorial Indulgences, 405
Of Purgatorian Societies, 330
Of Purgatory, 321
Of Ritualism, 296
Of Ritualism in Church of England, 300
Of Saint-Worship, 341
Of the Mass, 179, 307
Of the Treasury of Indulgences, 405
Of Transubstantiation, 173

- DEVELOPMENT of Wafer Communion, 177
 Prophetical, of Popery, 7
 Theological, of Popery, 6
 Theory of Popery, 1
- DEVELOPMENTS from Transubstantiation, 176
- "DEVIL'S Advocate" in Canonisation, 345
- DEUS on the Penal Obligations of Baptised Heretics, 95
- DEUS'S Reason for Public Sale of Romish Bibles in Protestant
 Lands, 78
- DIRECTORSHIP in Confessional, 143
- DISTINCTIVE Treatment of Religious and Political Popery, 17
- DOBLADO on Host Processions in Spain, 312
- DOUAY BIBLE, Notes on Church Authority over the Bible, 56
 On Celibacy, 209
 Prohibited without a Written Permission, 78
- DUBLIN REVIEW on the Jesuits in China, 267
- DULIA Worship Explained, 339
- DULLER on Jesuits, 250
- DUPIN on Indulgences, 401
- DUTY of Civil Governments as to the Confessional, 166

E

- EADIE on the Manufacture of a Roman Relic and Saint, 362
- EARDLEY, Sir Culling, on Compulsory Confession in Papal
 States, 148
- ECCLESIASTICAL Government, 25
 Indulgences, 403
 Popery, 40
 Traditions, 56, 59
- EDGAR on the Policy of Celibacy, 212
- EDUCATION of the Young the Peculiar Care of the Jesuits, 250
- EIGHTH Article of the Creed of Pius IV., 368
- ELIZABETH and the Jesuits, 251, 270
- ELLIOTT, on Corpus Christi Festival, 311
 On Priestly Profligacy in Spain, 121
- EPISCOPAL Indulgences, 404
- EPISTLES of Isidore, Falsehood of, 62
- EQUIVOCATION, Romish Teaching on, 262
- EUCCHARIST, Romish, 173
- EVANGELICAL Letters of Pius IX., 83
- EXPULSION of Jesuits from every European State, 269
- EXTREME Unction, 186
 Development of, 189
 Social and Political Relations of, 192
 Trent on, 187

F

- FALSE Religion a National Curse, 18
 FASTING Communion, 179
 FENIANISM, Plenary Indulgence of Irish, 413
 FERRARIS on Compulsory Baptism, 98
 FIFTH Article of the Creed of Pius IV., 305
 FIRST Article of Pius IV.'s Creed, Political Relations of, 55
 FLAGELLATIONS at Rome during Lent, 299
 FLEURY on Constantine's Forged Donation to the Papacy, 59
 On False Decretals of Isidore, 63
 On Forced Penance in Spain, 128
 FLORENCE, Council of, on Purgatory, 326
 Waddington on, 326
 FOURTH Article of the Creed of Pius IV., 302
 FRANKFORT, Council of, Condemned Image-Worship, 379
 FRANCE, Jesuits Banished from, 270
 FREEBOOTERS, Romish Bishops acting as such in Feudal
 Times, 240
 FRENCH Council on Jesuits, 257
 FRIARS, 214
 FUNCTION of Magistrate in Religion, 35
 FURNISS on Venial Theft, 106

G

- GENERALS of Romish Orders, 223
 GIBBON on Idolatry, 376
 GIESELER, on Paul's Relics at Rome, 358
 On the Corruptions caused by compulsory Celibacy, 213
 GOLDEN LEGEND, The, on Purgatory, 323
 GOTHER on Purgatorian Masses, 330
 GREGORY I. on Purgatory, 324
 GREGORY VI. Enforces Celibacy on the Priesthood, 211
 GREGORY IX. Introduces Bell-Music into Host Worship, 310
 GREGORY XIV. gives Plenary Indulgence to Irish Fenians, 413
 GREGORY XVI. against the Scriptures, 81
 GUIZOT on Penitential Development, 158

H

- HALF-Communion, 177
 HEALING, Power of, in the Early Church, 190
 HEATHENS Reject Christianity on account of Romish Transub-
 stantiation, 181
 HENRY VIII.'s Legacy for Soul Masses, 335

- HERETICAL Baptism Homologated by Rome, 94
 HERETICS to be Punished by Penal Laws, 58
 HISTORICAL Development of Popery, 5
 Study of Popery, 8
 HOLY Coat of Treves, Imposition of, 367
 HOMICIDE Commended by Jesuits, 260
 HONARIUS Institutes Host Worship, 310
 HOSIUS of Trent, his Disparagement of the Scriptures, 81
 HOST Worship, 310
 Development of, 179
 In Spain, 312
 In Street Processions, 311
 Trent on, 311
 HUGHES on the Decline and Rise of Protestantism, 130
 HUME on the Literary Crimes of Monks, 286

I

- IDOLATRY, Gross Popish, 310, *et seq.*, 315, 369, *et seq.*
 Jewish, 371, *et seq.*
 IGNATIUS Loyola and his Order, 244, *et seq.*
 Spiritual Exercises of, 248
 IMAGE-WORSHIP or Idolatry, 369
 Catechism of Trent on, 369, 370
 Development of, 374
 Development of, in Christian Church, 378
 Development of, in Jewish Church, 377
 Modern Developments of, 379
 Not in early Church, 378
 Of the Jews, through the Image, 371
 Primary and Secondary Developments of, 375
 Social and Political Associations of, 381
 Unscriptural, 374
 IMMACULATE Conception an Illustration of Popish Development, 6
 IMPRISONMENT of Nuns, 225, 282
 INDEPENDENCE of Church and State impossible, 26
 INDEX of Prohibited and Purged Books, with Extracts, 76
 INDIVIDUAL Monasticism, 235
 INDULGENCES, and the Reformation, 410
 Bouvier on, 386
 Congregation of, 410
 Crusadial, 399, 407
 Cullen on, 400
 Development of, 402

- INDULGENCES, do not Obviate Penance, 397
 Ecclesiastical, 403
 Episcopal, 404
 Hornihold on, 387
 Jubilistic, Development of, 408
 Kinds of, 395
 Merits of, Founded on Christ and the Saints, 393
 Nature of, 384, *et seq.*
 Of Tetzel, 400
 Papal, 405
 Penitential, Development of, 403
 Petition to Pope to Obtain, 390
 Plenary and Partial, 386, *et seq.*
 Plenary, to Irish Fenianism, 413
 Purgatorial, Development of, 405
 Purgatorian, 396
 Sale of, 404, 411
 Social and Political Relations of, 412
 Treasury of, Development of, 405
- INFIDEL Priests cannot Administer Romish Sacraments validly, 89
- INFIDELITY developed from Transubstantiation, 80
- INFLUENCE of Popery and Protestantism on Political Institutions, 19
- INFLUENCES, Political and National, of Religion, 18
- INNOCENT III. on Compulsory Baptism, 97
- INQUISITION, The, 241
 And the Waldensians, 67
 To Superintend, Revise, and Suppress Books, 75
- INSTITUTION, of Celibacy, 206
 Of Jesuits, 247
- INSTRUMENTAL Causes of Popish Political Development, 43
- INTENTION, of Priest Necessary for the Validity of a Sacrament, 86
 Political Relations of, 91
 Sacramental, 85
- INVASION of Britain now by Jesuits, 275
- INVISIBILITY of Romish Church, 91
- ISIDOREAN Epistles, Falsehood of, 62
- ITALIAN Bible Suppressed, 78

J

- JAMES v. 16. disproves Extreme Unction, 187
- JANSENIST Controversy, 253

- JAPAN, Jesuits Banished from, in consequence of their Political Intrigues, 266
- JESUITS, Acts of, 264
- Affiliated, 250
 - Banished from England, 270
 - Banished from France, 270
 - Banished from Portugal, 270
 - Banished from Russia, 271
 - Banished from Venice, 270
 - Constitution and Peculiarities of, 246
 - Expulsion of, from the States of Europe, 269
 - In China, 265, 267
 - In Edinburgh, 276
 - In Italy, 268
 - In Japan, 266
 - Institution and Establishment of, 247
 - Invasion of Britain now by, 275
 - Lord Palmerston's Testimony against, 274
 - Moral Principles of, 252
 - Order of, 243
 - Origin and Object of, 244
 - Restoration of, 273
 - Select Decisions of, 260
 - Suppression of, 271
- JEWS did not believe in Purgatory, 322
- Did not Worship Relics, 355
 - Scandalised by Romish Transubstantiation, 181
- JEWISH Church and State, 29
- JEWISH Priesthood, the Model of the Popish, 204
- Dark Career of, 204
- JEWISH Saints rejected by Rome, 238
- JOLY on the Jesuits, 246
- JUBILEES, Bouvier on, 408
- Development of, 408
 - Established by Boniface VIII., 408
- JUSTIFICATION, in Popery, 302
- The Scriptural, 303
 - Popish, Social and Political Bearings of, 304

K

- KEENAN, on Rome's Orders, 196
- On Sin remitted by Extreme Unction, 192
- KELLY, Popish Priest of Durham, accessory to Theft, 135

- KINGS, Heretical, may be justly Deposed and Murdered by Papists, 260, *et seq.*
 Inferior to Bishops, 57
 KING'S Confessor, 149
 KITTO on Abrogation of Deaconesses, 231

L

- LACORDAIRE on Soldier Monks, 225
 LATERAN, Council of, on Compulsory Confession, 128, 147
 On Printing, 75
 On True Position of Laity in the Church, 199
 LATRIA Worship Explained, 339
 LAWSUIT, Purgatorian, 334
 LEGISLATION, Popish, on Bible, 74
 LEO XII. against the Scriptures, 81
 LIES for a Good Cause, 61
 Venial, 108
 LIGUORI on Confessional, 136
 LOTTERIES, Purgatorian, 332
 LOUIS the Meek's Gifts to the Papacy, 61
 LUTHER the Moses of the Reformation, 68

M

- MAGISTRATES should deal with Transubstantiation as a Blasphemy, 186
 MAGISTERIAL Authority in Religion, 34, 35
 MAHOMET condemned Image-Worship, 377
 MAHOMETANS Prejudiced against Christianity on account of Romish Transubstantiation, 181
 MARK vi. 13. Disproves Extreme Unction, 187
 MARKS of the Church, 10
 MARRIAGE Honourable in all, and especially necessary for Pastors, 210
 MARTINI'S Italian Bible Suppressed, 78
 MASS, The, 306
 Development of, 179, 307
 Enormous Trade in, 313
 Refuted, 307
 Ritualism of, 298
 Social and Political Influences of, 313
 Trade not Destroyed by Indulgences, 389
 Waddington on, 309
 MASSES for Souls in Purgatory, 329, *et seq.*

- MASSARI (Italian Statesman) on Italian Brigandage, 161, *et seq.*
- MATRIMONY, Pius IX. on, 294
 Political Relations of, 292
 Popish, derived from Heathenism, 291
 Sacrament of, 289
 Trent on, 292
- MATTER, No Sacramental, in Penance, 110
- M'CORRY on the Political Astuteness of the Papacy, 144
- M'GHEE on Penitentiaries, 155
- M'HALE Corrupts the Scriptures to prove Extreme Unction, 188
- M'KRAY on the Evil of Saint-days, 353
- M'LAUGHLAN, Popish Priest of Glasgow, refuses Evidence to
 Convict of Theft, 134, 137
- MENDICANCY a Virtue in Popery, 214
- MENDICANT Orders, 240
- MICHELET on Confessional Directorship, 144, 165
 On Confessional Training of Priests, 169
- MILITARY Orders, 239
- MILNER, on Church Authority over the Scriptures, 69, 73
 On Immaculate Conception, 65
- MISSAL on Transubstantiation, 175
- MISSIONS of the Jesuits, Nature of, 264
- MODEL-RELICS, Worship of, 364
- MODERN Developments of Image-Worship, 379
- MOHLER and Newman on Development, 13
- MONASTICISM, Congregational, 236
 Denominational, 237
 Development of, 232
 Individual or Solitary, 235
 Social and Political Relations of, 278
 Testimonies to Social and Political Evils of, 285
- MONASTIC, Institutions should be Suppressed, 284
 Orders, 213, 237
 Prisons; 224
- MONEY Payments for Indulgences, 404
- MORAL Principles of the Jesuits, 252
- MORNING JOURNAL on the M'Laughlan Confessional Case, 138
- MORNING POST on the M'Laughlan Confessional Case, 137
- MORSE on Corpus Christi Festival at Rome, 315
- MORTAL and Venial Sin, 182
- MORTARA Case, *Tablet* on, 98
- MORTMAIN Act Defeated by Popery, 193
- MORTMAIN Committee and Romish Nunneries, 228
- MOSHEIM, on Corpus Christi Festival, 310

MOSHEIM, on Crusades, 407

On False Decretals of Isidore, 62

On Penances, 157

On Ritualism, 297

On Saint and Relic Worship, 343, 360

On the Treasury of Indulgences, 405

MOTIVE Causes of Popish Political Development, 43

MUTUAL Independence of Church and State impossible, 26

MYSTERY of Iniquity Developed before the Endowment of the Church by Constantine, 40

N

NATIONAL, Influences of Religion, 18

Prosperity dependent upon National Religion, 381

Sin Proves Magisterial Authority in Religion, 35

NAZIANZEN, St, on the Supremacy of the Church over the State, 37

NECESSITY and Duty of Controversy, 15

NICENE and Pius IV.'s Creed not the same, 55, 67

NICE, Second Council of, Established Image Worship, 379

NICOLINI, on Confessional Espionage, 163

On Jesuits, 255

NINTH Article of Creed, 383

NOLAN on Confession before Crime, 133.

NOVICES, Jesuit, 248

NUNNERIES, Scriptural, 229.

NUNS, Imprisonment of, 225

O

OBEDIENCE, Vow of, 222, 281

Wiseman on, 223

OBLIGATIONS, of Confessional, 127

Of Heretical Baptism, 95

OBSCENE Popish Books, 366

ORDER of the Jesuits, 243

ORDERS, 195

Bestowed by *Presbyters*, not Bishops, 197

Development of Popish, 198

Keenan on, 196

Mendicants, 240

Military, 239

Monastic, 213

Rivalry between the Regular and Secular, 238

Sacramental, referred to in illustration of "Intention," 90

ORDERS, Seven in Papacy, 196

True Nature of Scriptural, 197, *et seq.*

ORGANISATION for Study of Controversy, 1, 12

ORIGEN on Purgatory, 323

OWENS on Peter's Chains at Rome, 364

P

PAGAN Belief in Purgatory, 367

PALMERSTON on the Jesuits, 274

PAPAL, Aggression, 22

Indulgences, 405

States, Compulsory Confessional in, 147

PARAPHRASE of the Creed of Pius IV., 51

PARLIAMENTARY Declaration against Transubstantiation, 183

PARSONS the Jesuit, 251

PASCAL, on Jesuit Principles, 253

On the Jesuits, 246

PAUL the Hermit, 235

PENAL Laws against Heretics, 58

PENANCE, 102

Compulsory, 127, *et seq.*

No Sacrament, 110

PENANCES, 156

PENITENTIAL, Indulgences, 403

Satisfactions on Death-bed, 193

System, Development of, 157

PENITENTIARIES, 155

PEPIN, Forged Letter from St Peter delivered to, 60

PERFECTION, Counsels of, 214, *et seq.*

PHILIP V. of Spain's Enormous Legacy for Masses, 335

PHILLIP on the Literary Crimes of Monks, 287

PIGHIUS of Trent Designated the Scriptures "a Nose of Wax," 73

PIUS IV. on Confessional Solicitations to Crime, 121

PIUS IV.'s Creed, 49

PIUS VII. against the Scriptures, 81

PIUS IX. against the Scriptures, 83

POLICY of Celibacy, 211

POLITICAL, 7, 41

Confusion of Co-ordination in Church and State, 31

Constitution of Popery, 20

Evils of Co-ordination, 32

Faith of Popery, 16

Study of Popery, 10

POLITICAL Relations, see also "Social and Political Relations"

POLITICAL Relations of Church and State, 26

Of Confirmation, 170

Of First Article of Creed, 55

Of Intention, 91

Of Matrimony, 292

Of Pius IV.'s Creed, 52

Of Priesthood and Priestcraft, 204

Of Religion, 18

Of Second Article of Creed, 65

Of the Bible, 66

Of the Confessional, 144

Of the Sponsorial System of the Papacy, 101

Of Third Article of Creed, 83

Of Tradition, 56, 57, 59

Of Transubstantiation, 182

Of Venial Sin, 109

POLICY of Popery and Protestantism in Church and State Relations, 36

POPERY, always changing, 1

A Spiritual and Political Despotism, 7, 17

Civil and Ecclesiastical, 40

Creates a Depraved Conscience, 53

Declines Abroad, but Progresses in Britain, 21

Hates the Scriptures, 67, *et seq.*

Its Policy in the Relations of Church and State, 36

Its Stages of Development and Destruction, 11

Not now Professed as an originally Complete System, 1

Political Basis of, 48

Politics of, 16

The Great Theme of Church History, 9

To be Resisted by all, 17

To be Treated as a Political Conspiracy, 20

POPE, The, Abuses Religion for Secular Ends, 19

Exalts Himself above all Civil Rulers, 38

May Depose Kings and Dispose of Kingdoms, 260

May inflict Corporeal Penalties, 57

Stephen's Forgery of a Letter from Peter to Pepin, 60

The Antichrist, 38, *et seq.*

The Exclusive Treasurer of Indulgence Merit, 384

POPE'S Bulls against the Scriptures, 81

POPISH, Baptism, 93

Homologation of Heretical Baptism, 94

PORTUGAL, Jesuits banished from, 270

POVERTY, Cobbett on, 220

- POVERTY, D'Aubigné on, 219
 Paul condemns, 222
 Rhemish Testament on, 221
 Vow of, 219, 279, *et seq.*
- POWERS of Pius IV., 50
- PRAYERS, for the Dead, 342
 Through the Merits of Saints, 342
- PRIEST the Papist's Rule, 74
- PRIEST-WORSHIP, 313
- PRIESTS, Former Exemptions of, from Taxation, 58
- PRIESTCRAFT, 205
- PRIESTHOOD, and Priestcraft, Political Relations of, 204
 Development of a Sacrificing, 180
 The True, Possessed by all Christians, 201
- PRIESTLY Profligacy, 120
- PRINTING Press, the Doom of Popery, 67
- PRISONS, Monastic, 224
- PROBABILITY, Jesuit Doctrine of, 259
- PROBABLE Decisions of Jesuit Doctors, 260
- PROFESSED Jesuits, 249
 Vow of, 250
- PROGRESS, of Popery in Britain and Protestant Lands, 21
 Of Confessional in Britain, 130
- PROPHETICAL Popery, 10
 Development of, 7
- PROTESTANT Principle of the Relations of Church and State, 36
- PROTESTANTS, Abuse of, in Rome and Spain for Refusing to
 Worship the Host, 315, 316
- PROTESTANTISM declining in Britain, 22, 23
 Prospective Peril of, in Britain, 23
- PUBLICATIONS, Suppression of Confessional, 169
- PURGATORY, 316
 A Doctrine of Pagans, 317
 A means of Papal and Priestly Pelf, 329
 Bellarmine on, 325
 Council of Florence on, 326
 Deathbed, Power of, 334
 Development of, 321
 Doyle on, 319
 Effect of, on Irish Papists, 328
 Golden Legend on, 324
 Gother on Masses for Souls in, 330
 Gregory I. propagates, 323
 Keenan on, 318

- PURGATORY, Mosheim on, 323
 Not believed by the Jews, 322
 Origen on, 323
 Refuted by Scripture, 318, *et seq.*
 Social and Political Relations of, 327
 Tertullian on, 322
 Trent on, 317, 327
- PURGATORIAN, Indulgences, Development of, 405
 Joint Stock Societies, 330
 Lawsuit, 334
 Lotteries, 332
 Swindling, 333
- PUSEYISM in England, 131

Q

- QUARTERLY REVIEW on Jesuits, 269

R

- REEVE on Popish and Priestly Profligacy, 120
- REFORMATION and Indulgences, 410
- RELATIONS, of Church and State, 26, *et seq.*
 Mutual, of Scripture and Tradition, 69
 Political, see "Political Relations"
- RELICS, Congregation of, 361
 Council of Trent on, 354
 Forbidden in England by Law, 366
 Not Worshipped by Jews, 355
 Of Paul at Rome, 358
 Of the Saints, 354
 Used to Consecrate Churches, 357
- RELIC-WORSHIP, Development of, 356
 Social Evils of, 365
- RELIGIOUS Liberty the Shallow Pretext for Papal Exemption
 from State Control, 40
- RESTORATION of Jesuits, 273
- RHEMISH Testament, on Counsels of Perfection, 216
 On Monkish Poverty, 221
- RITUALISM, 296
 Development of, 296
 Development of, in Church of England, 300
 Mosheim on, 297
 Of Greek Church, 298
 Romish, particularly in the Mass, 298
 Social and Political Influence of, 301
 Thomson on Roman, 299

- RIVALRY between Regular and Secular Orders, 233
 ROBERTSON on Priestly Profligacy, 120
 ROME the Foretold Apostasy and Mother of Fornications, 119, *et seq.*, 209, 213
 ROMISH Directory on Parsons the Jesuit, 252
 RONGE and the Holy Coat of Treves, 367
 ROYAL Declaration against Transubstantiation, 183
 RULES of a Purgatorian Society, 330
 RUSSIA, Banishment of Jesuits from, 271

S

- SACRAMENT, of Matrimony, 289
 Of Penance, 102
 SACRAMENTS, Sale of, 84
 Are Invalid without Intention of Priest, 87
 Trent on, 86
 SACRAMENTAL Intention, 85
 Defects of, 87
 Missal on, 87
 SACRIFICING Priesthood, Development of, 180
 SAINTS, Canonisation of, 337, *et seq.*
 Relics of, 354
 Traditional and Canonical, 338
 Treasury of their Merits, 384
 SAINT-DAYS, St Cyril on, 351
 Mischief of, 350
 SAINT-WORSHIP, 336, *et seq.*
 Development of, 341
 Social and Political Influences of, 350
 Unscriptural, 340, 353
 SATAN allowed 1260 Years to Erect the Papacy, 11
 SATISFACTION Explained, 392
 SATISFACTIONS, Deathbed, 193
 SCHOLARS, Jesuit, 249
 SCRIPTURE, a National as well as Individual Rule of Life, 18
 And Tradition not Rome's Rule, 2
 SCRIPTURES, Adulterated and Falsified by Papists,
 Alone the Rule of Faith, 72
 And Tradition, 69, 70
 Corrupted by M'Hale to Prove Extreme Unction, 188
 Corrupted to Prove Marriage a Sacrament, 210, 289
 Papal Bulls against, 81
 Political Relations of, 66
 Popish Legislation on, 74

- SCRIPTURES Prohibited by Trent, 76
 Rigorously Forbidden in Spain, 78
 The Expositor and Witness of Tradition, 71
- SCRIPTURAL Nunneries, 229
- SEAL of Confessional, 123
 Dispensable, 124
- SECRET-TELLING Venial, 108
- SECOND Article of Pius IV.'s Creed, Political Relations of, 65
- SECULAR Aims of Popery, 19
- SEVENTH Article of Creed, 336
- SEYMOUR, Rev. H., on Jesuit Missions, 265
 On Conventual Robbery, 227
- SIMONY of the Papacy, 84
- SIN, divided by Rome into Venial and Mortal, 102
 Of all Degrees Forgiven by Extreme Unction, 192
- SIXTH Article of the Creed of Pius IV., 316
- SOCIAL and Political Evils of Monasticism, 285
- SOCIAL and Political Influences of the Mass, 313
- SOCIAL and Political Influence of Ritualism, 301
- SOCIAL and Political Relations of Extreme Unction, 192
 Of Image Worship, 381
 Of Indulgences, 412
 Of Monasticism, 278
 Of Purgatory, 327
 Of Relic Worship, 365
 Of Saint-Worship, 350
- SOCIAL Evil Caused and Propagated by Confessional, 119
- SOUTHEY on the Literary Crimes of Monks, 286
- SPAIN, Compulsory Penances in, 128
 Evil of Saint-Days in, 353
 Host-Worship in, 312, 316
 Profligacy of Priesthood in, 121
 Scriptures Forbidden in, 76
- SPECTATOR on M'Laughlan Confessional Case, 137
- SPIRITUAL Basis of Political Popery, 48
- SPIRITUAL Exercises of Ignatius Loyola, 248
- SPONSORIAL System, Trent on, 101
- S ONSORS, in Baptism, 101
 In Confirmation, 173
- STATE, must be Supreme even in Church Matters, 28, *et seq.*
 Relations with Church, 26
- STUDY of Historical Popery, 8
 Of Political Popery, 10
 Of Popery according to its Development, 8

- STUDY, of Prophetical Popery, 10
 Of Theological Popery, 9
 STYLITES, the Pillar Saints, 236
 SUPEREROGATION Explained, 385
 SUPERSTITION, The Power of Popery through, 53
 SUPPRESSION, of Bible by Rome, 67, 76, *et seq.*
 Of Monastic Institutions in Britain called for, 284
 Partial, of Monks, 242
 Of the Jesuits by "Infallibility"—Pope Clement, 271
 SWINDLING, Purgatorial, 333

T

- TABLET on the Clandestine Stealth and Baptism of the Boy
 Mortara, 98
 TAXES, Self-exemption of Priests from, 58
 TEMPORAL Means in the Church, 30
 TEN Commandments first given Orally, then Written, as a Testi-
 mony, 71
 TERTULLIAN on Purgatory, 322
 TETZEL'S Indulgences, 400
 THEFT, Venial, 104
 Without Restitution, Lawful according to Jesuits, 261, 263
 THEOLOGICAL Development of Popery, 6
 THIRD Article of Creed of Pius IV., 83
 THOMSON on Lenten Flagellations at Rome, 299
 TRACTS FOR THE TIMES, on Development, 5
 On study of Romanism, 9
 TRADING Corporation, Jesuits a, 268
 Monks as a, 280
 TRADITION, and Scripture, true Relationship between, 70
 Apostolical and Ecclesiastical, 56
 Must be Interpreted by Scripture, 70
 Must be Witnessed and Expounded by Scripture, 71
 None for Immaculate Conception in Milner's day, 65
 Not now Rome's Rule, 2
 Political Relations of, 56, 57, 59
 Relation of, to Development, 64
 Utilitarian Basis of, 61
 TRANSUBSTANTIATION a cause of Infidelity to Heathen, Jew,
 and Mahometan, 181
 A clear Violation of Statute Law against Blasphemy, 183
 Development of, 173
 Developments from, 176
 Missal on, 175

- TRANSUBSTANTIATION, Political Relations of, 182
 Royal and Parliamentary Declaration against, 183
 TRENT, Catechism of, on the Quasi-matter of Penance, 111
 On Celibacy, 207
 On Compulsory Confession, 127
 On Corpus Christi Festival, 311
 On Extreme Unction, 187
 On Heretical Baptism, 94, *et seq.*
 On Monkish Prisons, 225
 On Relic Worship, 354
 On Reserved Absolution, 153
 On Sponsors, 101
 On the Sacraments, 86, *et seq.*
 On Vow of Chastity, 217

U

- UNCTION, Extreme, see "Extreme Unction"
 UNION, The, on English Confessional, 131
 URBAN II. Institutes the Crusades, 407
 URBAN VIII. gives Plenary Indulgence to Irish Fenians, 414
 UTILITARIAN Basis of Tradition, 61

V

- VENIAL LIES, 108
 VENIAL SIN, 102
 Expounded by *What every Christian must Know and Do*,
 105
 In its Political Relations, 109
 Secret-Telling a, 108
 VENICE, Jesuits banished from, 270
 VIRGIL'S Description of Purgatory, 317
 VOWS, may be Dispensed by the Pope, 261
 Of Jesuits, 248
 Old Testament, 216
 Popish, 216

W

- WADDINGTON, on the Mendicant Orders, 242
 On the Ritualism of Greek Church, 298
 WAFER Communion, 177
 WALDENSIANS, 67
 WAGNER and the Confessional, 142
 WEEKLY REGISTER, on Bambino Worship, 380
 On the Iniquitous Treatment of Protestants Abroad, who
 refuse to Worship the Host, 316

- WHITBY given to Priests for Soul Masses, 335
WILLS Made and Altered by Priests, 194, *et seq.*
WISEMAN on Canonisation, 345
 On Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius, 248
WOLSEY'S Suppression of Monasteries, 284
WYLIE, Dr, on Church and State, 27
 On Jesuits in Italy, 268

